#### CHAPTER 1

#### **INTRODUCTION**

# **PURPOSE**

1.1 The standards and guidance contained in this document, often referred to as generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS), are intended for use by government auditors¹ to ensure that they maintain integrity, objectivity, and independence in planning, conducting, and reporting their work, and are to be followed by auditors and audit organizations when required by law, regulation, contract, agreement, or policy.² The work performed in accordance with GAGAS is referred to as audits and attestation engagements. This work, which is described in this chapter and more fully in chapter 2, includes financial audits, attestation engagements, and performance audits. Users of government audits and attestation engagements that are performed in accordance with GAGAS should have confidence that the work is objective and credible.

**1.1** 1.2 The standards and guidance in this document are This document contains standards for audits and attestation engagements of government entities organizations,

<sup>1</sup>This document addresses the standards that should be used by the individuals conducting the broad array of work that is described more fully in chapter 2. Accordingly, the focus of this document is not on the wide variety of titles that are used by individuals conducting and reporting on this work, but instead the nature of the work that is being performed. The term "auditor" throughout this document includes individuals who may be titled auditor, analyst, evaluator, or a similar position description.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Requirements in GAGAS are identified by statements that include the word "should." Auditors are expected to comply with these requirements if they apply to the type of work being performed. Auditors are strongly encouraged to comply with the guidance provided by GAGAS.

programs, <sup>3</sup> activities, and services and functions, and of government assistance received administered by contractors, nonprofit entities organizations, and other nongovernment entities organizations. Adherence to GAGAS These standards, often referred to as generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS), can help ensure that audits and attestation engagements provide credibility to the information reported by or obtained from management through objectively acquiring and evaluating evidence. When auditors perform their work in this manner and comply with GAGAS in reporting the results, their work can lead to improved government management, decision-making, and oversight, and can assist in fulfilling the government's duty to be accountable to the public. are to be followed by auditors and audit organizations when required by law, regulation, agreement, contract, or policy. The standards GAGAS pertain to auditors' professional qualifications; and the quality of audit effort their work, the performance of field work, and the characteristics of professional and meaningful audit reports reporting.

1.3 This chapter describes the applications of GAGAS by auditors and audit organizations. This chapter also describes the concept of accountability for public resources and discusses the responsibilities of managers of government programs, auditors, and audit organizations in the audit process.

<sup>-</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Henceforth, the term "program" will be used in this document to include government entities, services, and activities.

### APPLICABILITY

1.4 GAGAS are intended to be followed in performing audits and attestation engagements. A number of statutes and other mandates require that auditors follow GAGAS. Where a statute or other mandate does not exist, auditors will find it useful to use GAGAS in work regarding the use of government funds. If auditors hold themselves out as following GAGAS, regardless of whether they are required to follow such standards, they need to justify any departures from them.

1.5 The following laws, regulations, or guidelines require use of GAGAS:

1.2 a. Federal legislation *The Inspector General Act of 1978*, as amended, 5 U.S.C. App. (2000)) requires that the statutorily appointed federal inspectors general comply with GAGAS the Comptroller General's standards for audits of federal entities organizations, programs, activities, and functions. The legislation act further states that the inspectors general are to ensure that should take appropriate steps to ensure that any work performed by nonfederal auditors complyies with these standards GAGAS. when they audit federal organizations, programs, activities, and functions.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, 5 U.S.C. App. (1982).

**1.3** Other federal auditors must also follow these standards. The Office of Management and budget (OMB) included these standards in OMB Circular A-73<sup>5</sup> as basic audit criteria for federal executive departments and agencies.

**1.4** b. The Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-576), as expanded by the Government Management Reform Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-356), requires that these standards GAGAS be followed in audits of federal departments' and agencies' financial statements.<sup>4</sup>

1.5 c. The Single Audit Act of 1984 Amendments of 1996 (Public Law 104-156) requires that these standards GAGAS be followed in audits of state and local governments and nonprofit entities which that receive federal financial assistance. 6 OMB Circular A-133, "Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-profit Organizations," which provides the government-wide guidelines and policies on performing audits to comply with the Single Audit Act, also requires the use of GAGAS.

1.7 1.6 Auditors conducting audits under need to be alert to other laws, regulations, or other authoritative sources that could require the use of GAGAS. For example, state and local laws and regulations may require auditors at the state and local levels of government to follow these standards. Also, the terms of an agreement or contract also

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Section 6 of OMB Circular A 73, "Audit of Federal Operations and Programs."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>-The Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-576)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>The Single Audit of 1984 (31 U.S.C. 7501 7507

may be required *auditors* to comply with *GAGAS*. these standards under the terms of the agreement or contract. 1.6 Other federal policies and regulations, such as OMB Circular A-133, Federal audit guidelines pertaining to program requirements, such as those issued for Housing and Urban Development and Student Financial Aid programs, may require that *GAGAS* these standards be followed in audits of institutions of higher education and other nonprofit organizations that receive federal financial assistance.<sup>7</sup>

1.8 1.7 Even if not required to do so, auditors would find it useful to follow GAGAS

The standards in this document are generally relevant to and recommended for use by state and local government auditors and public accountants in performing audits of federal, state, and local government organizations, programs, activities, and functions as well as in performing audits of government assistance administered by contractors, nonprofit entities, and other nongovernment entities. Several state and local Many audit organizations not formally required to do so, both in the United States and in other countries, as well as several nations, have officially adopted voluntarily follow GAGAS these standards.

1.8 Auditors may provide professional services, other than audits and attestation engagements, that consist solely of gathering, providing, and explaining information requested by decision makers or by providing advice or assistance to management officials. GAGAS are not applicable to these other professional services, which are described more fully in chapter 2. However, providing other professional services may

<sup>133, &</sup>quot;Audits of Institutions of Higher Education and Other Nonprofit Institutions."

affect an audit organization's independence to conduct audits, which is discussed in chapter 3.

# Relationship between GAGAS and Other Professional Standards

1.9 GAGAS may be used in conjunction with professional standards issued by other authoritative bodies. For example, the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) has issued auditing and attestation professional standards that apply in financial audits and attestation engagements. GAGAS incorporate the AICPA's field work and reporting standards and the related statements on the standards for financial audits unless specifically excluded, as discussed in chapters 4 and 5. GAGAS incorporates the AICPA's general standard on criteria, and the field work and reporting standards and the related statements on the standards for attestation engagements, unless specifically excluded, as discussed in chapter 6. To meet the needs of users of government audits and attestation engagements, GAGAS also prescribe additional requirements to those provided by the AICPA for these types of work. The Institute of Internal Auditors and the American Evaluation Association (formerly the Evaluation Research Society) have issued related standards.

1.10 Other professional standards which may be used by auditors are issued by such bodies as the Institute of Internal Auditors (Codification of the Standards for the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Codification of the Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing, The Institute of Internal Auditors, Inc., copyright 1993; and New Directions for Program Evaluation: Standards for Evaluation Practice, no. 15. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, September 1982.

Professional Practice of Internal Auditing, The Institute of Internal Auditors, Inc.), and the American Evaluation Association, which has developed guiding principles for evaluators (Guiding Principles for Evaluators, a report from the American Evaluation Association Task Force on Guiding Principles for Evaluators). These other professional standards are not incorporated into GAGAS, but can be used in conjunction with GAGAS.

#### ACCOUNTABILITY

1.10 1.11 Our system of managing public programs today rests on an elaborate structure of relationships among all levels of government. While not always specified by law, The concept of accountability for public resources is inherent in the our nation's governing processes. of this nation. 1.11 The need for accountability has caused a demand for more information about government programs and services. They also Public Legislators and other government officials, legislators, and eitizens the public want and need to know whether (1) government funds resources are handled managed properly and used in compliance with laws and regulations., (2) government programs are achieving their objectives and desired outcomes, They also want and need to know whether government organizations, programs, and services are achieving their purposes, and whether these organizations, programs, or services are operating and (3) government programs are being provided efficiently, economically, and efficiently effectively. 1.10 Officials and employees who mManagers of these programs are often asked to need to render an account of their activities and related results to legislative bodies and the public. While

not always specified by law, this accountability concept is inherent in the governing process of this nation.

1.12 This document provides auditing standards to help provide accountability and to assist public officials and employees in carrying out their responsibilities. These standards are more than the codification of current practices. They include concepts and audit areas that are still evolving and are vital to the accountability objectives sought in auditing governments and their programs and services.

## **BASIC PREMISES**

- 1.13 The following premises underlie these standards and were considered in their development.
- a. The term "audit" includes both financial and performance audits.
- b. Moved to paragraph 1.17
- c. Moved to paragraph 1.18
- d. Moved to paragraph 1.19
- e. Moved to paragraph 1.19

g. 1.12 Financial audits auditing—contributes to making governments more accountable for the use of public resources. The auditor, in providing an providing accountability since it provides independent reports on whether an entity's financial information is presented fairly in accordance with recognized criteria, informs users whether they can rely on the information. Financial audits performed in accordance with GAGAS also provide and/or on its information about internal controls and compliance with laws and regulations as they relate to financial transactions, systems, and processes.

1.13 Attestation engagements also contribute to governments' accountability for the use of public resources and the delivery of services. In an attestation engagement, auditors issue an examination, a review, or an agreed-upon procedures report on the subject matter or on an assertion about the subject matter, based on or in conformity with criteria, that is the responsibility of another party. Attestation engagements can cover a broad range of financial or nonfinancial objectives and provide various levels of assurance about the subject matter or assertion dependent upon the user's needs.

h. 1.14 Performance auditings also contribute to governments' accountability for the use of public resources and for the delivery of services. providing accountability since it The term performance audit is used to include a variety of objectives to meet users' needs. Performance audits provides an independent assessment of the performance and management of a government organizations, programs, activity, or function against objective criteria or an assessment of best practices and other information.

Performance audits in order to provide information to improve program operations public accountability and facilitate decision-making by parties with responsibility to oversee or initiate corrective action, and improve public accountability. The term performance audit is used generically to include work classified by some audit organizations as program evaluations, program effectiveness and results audits, economy and efficiency audits, operational audits, and value-for-money audits.

i. To realize governmental accountability, the citizens, their elected representatives, and program managers need information to assess the integrity, performance, and stewardship of the government's activities. Thus, unless legal restrictions or ethical considerations prevent it, audit reports should be available to the public and to other levels of government that have supplied resources.<sup>8</sup>

1.15 Given the importance and complexity of government programs in providing a variety of public services, auditors are increasingly being called on by legislative bodies and government agencies to expand the variety of performance audits to include work that has a prospective focus or provides guidance, best practice information, or information on issues that affect multiple programs or entities already studied or under study by an audit organization. This work may also include an assessment of policy alternatives, identification of risks and risk mitigation efforts, and a variety of analytical services to aid government officials in performing their responsibilities and stewardship of government resources. Such work, like other performance audits,

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>-The Single Audit Act (31 U.S.C. 7502(f)) requires that the reports on single audits be made available for public inspection.

involves a level of analysis, research, or evaluation; may provide conclusions and recommendations; and results in a report.

## **ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

1.16 Management and auditors of government programs fulfill essential roles and responsibilities in ensuring that public resources are used efficiently, economically, effectively, and legally. Audit organizations also have the important responsibility for ensuring that auditors can meet their responsibilities. These unique roles involve sound management practices and professional audits and attestation engagements.

# Management's Role

**1.13b.** *1.17* Public officials and others *Management* entrusted with handling public resources (for example, managers of a not-for-state or local governmental entity or a nonprofit entity organization that receives federal assistance) are is responsible for applying those resources efficiently, economically, and effectively, and legally to achieve the purposes for which the resources were furnished or the program was established. This responsibility applies to all resources, both financial and physical, whether entrusted to public officials or others by their own constituencies or by other levels of government.

**1.13c.** *1.18* Public officials and others *Management* entrusted with public resources are *is* responsible for complying with applicable laws and regulations. That responsibility encompasses identifying the requirements with which the entity and the official must comply and implementing systems designed to achieve that compliance.

1.13d. 1.19 Public officials and others Management entrusted with public resources are is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal controls to ensure that appropriate goals and objectives are met; resources are received, used efficiently and effectively, and safeguarded; laws and regulations are followed; and reliable data are obtained, maintained, and fairly disclosed. 1.13e. Public officials and others entrusted with public resources are accountable both to the public and to other levels and branches of government for the resources provided to carry out government programs and services. Consequently, they should provide Management is responsible for providing appropriate reports to those whom oversee their actions and to the public in order to be they are accountable for the resources used to carry out government programs and the results of these programs.

1.20 Management is responsible for addressing the findings and recommendations of auditors, and for establishing and maintaining a process to track the status of such findings and recommendations.

**1.13f.** *1.21* Audit of government reporting is an essential element of public control and accountability. Auditing provides credibility to the information reported by or obtained from management through objectively acquiring and evaluating evidence. The

importance and comprehensive nature of auditing place a special responsibility on public officials or others entrusted with public resources, who authorize or arrange audits to be done in accordance with these standards. This responsibility is to provide audit coverage that is broad enough to help fulfill reasonable needs of potential users of the audit report. Management is responsible for following sound procurement practices when contracting for audits and attestation engagements, including procedures for monitoring contract performance, need to be in place. The objectives and scope of the assignment need to be made clear. In addition to price, other factors that may be considered in evaluating bid proposals include the responsiveness of the bidder to the request for proposal; the experience of the bidder; the availability of the bidder's staff who have the appropriate professional qualifications and technical abilities; and the results of the bidder's peer reviews.

## **Auditors' Responsibilities**

- 1.22 Auditors in discharging their professional responsibilities need to observe the principles of serving the public interest and maintaining the highest sense of integrity, objectivity, and independence. These principles are fundamental to the responsibilities of auditors and the auditing profession.
- 1.23 Auditors are responsible to accept the obligation to act in a way that will serve the public interest, honor the public trust, and uphold their professionalism. A distinguishing mark of a profession is acceptance of its responsibility to the public.

  This responsibility is critical when auditing in the government environment. Because

the concept of accountability underlies GAGAS, this need to serve the public interest is essential for all work done in accordance with GAGAS.

1.24 Auditors need to make decisions that are consistent with the public interest in the program or activity under audit. The public interest is defined as the collective well-being of the community of people and entities the auditor serves. In discharging their professional responsibilities, auditors may encounter conflicting pressures from management of the audited entity, various levels of government, employers, and others who rely on the objectivity and independence of the auditors. In resolving those conflicts, auditors are responsible to act with integrity, guided by the precept that when auditors fulfill their responsibilities to the public, these individuals' and organizations' interests are best served.

1.25 To maintain and broaden public confidence, auditors need to perform all professional responsibilities with the highest sense of integrity. Auditors are responsible to be honest and candid with the audited entity and users of the auditors' work in the conduct of their work, within the constraints of the audited entity's confidentiality. Service and the public trust should not be subordinated to personal gain and advantage. Integrity can accommodate the inadvertent error and the honest difference of opinion; it cannot accommodate deceit or subordination of principle. Integrity requires auditors to observe both the form and the spirit of technical and ethical standards; circumvention of those standards constitutes subordination of judgment. Integrity also requires auditors to observe the principles of objectivity and independence.

1.26 Auditors are responsible to maintain objectivity and be free of conflicts of interest in discharging their professional responsibilities. Auditors are also responsible to be independent in fact and appearance when providing audit and attestation services.

Objectivity is a state of mind that requires auditors to be impartial, intellectually honest, and free of conflicts of interest. Independence precludes relationships that may in fact or appearance impair an auditor's objectivity in performing the audit. The maintenance of objectivity and independence requires continuing assessment of relationships with the audited entities and public responsibility.

1.27 In applying GAGAS, auditors are responsible for using professional judgment when establishing scope and methodologies for their work, determining the tests and procedures to be performed, conducting the work, and reporting the results. Auditors need to maintain integrity and objectivity when doing their work to make decisions that are consistent with the broader public interest in the program or activity under review. When reporting on the results of their work, auditors are responsible for disclosing all material or significant facts known to them which, if not disclosed, could mislead knowledgeable users, misrepresent the results, or conceal improper or unlawful practices.

1.13f. 1.28 Auditors can are responsible for helping management and other report users assist public officials and others in-understanding the auditors' responsibilities under GAGAS and other audit coverage required by law or regulation. To help managers and other report users understand an audit's objectives, time frames, and

data needs, auditors need to communicate information concerning the planning, conduct, and reporting of the assignment to the parties involved. This comprehensive nature of auditing also highlights the importance of auditors clearly understanding the audit objectives, the scope of the work to be conducted, and the reporting requirements.

## Audit Organizations' Responsibilities

1.14 1.29 The comprehensive nature of auditing done in accordance with these standards places on the a Audit organizations also have the responsibility for ensuring that (1) (2) independence and objectivity are is maintained in all phases of the assignment, (2) professional judgment is used in planning and performing the work and in reporting the results, (3) applicable standards are followed in planning and conducting audits and reporting the results, (1) the audit work is conducted performed by personnel who collectively have the necessary skills are professionally competent, and (4) their systems of quality control are periodically examined by independent peers to ensure that they have in place appropriately designed policies, procedures, and practices that are functioning effectively to meet professional standards. the organization has an appropriate internal quality control systems in place, and (5) the organization undergoes an external quality control review:

1.30 While management is responsible for addressing audit and attestation engagement findings and recommendations and tracking their status of resolution, audit organizations are responsible for establishing policies and procedures for follow-

up to determine whether previous findings and recommendations are addressed and are considered in planning future assignments.

#### PROCUREMENT OF AUDIT SERVICES

1.15 While not an audit standard, it is important that a sound procurement practice be followed when contracting for audit services. Sound contract award and approval procedures, including the monitoring of contract performance, should be in place. The objectives and scope of the audit should be made clear. In addition to price, other factors to be considered include the responsiveness of the bidder to the request for proposal; the experience of the bidder; availability of bidder staff with professional qualifications and technical abilities; and the results of the bidders' external quality control reviews.

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See <u>How to Avoid a Substandard Audit: Suggestions for Procuring an Audit, National Intergovernmental Audit Forum, May 1988.</u>

#### CHAPTER 2

# TYPES OF GOVERNMENT AUDITS AND ATTESTATION ENGAGEMENTS

#### PURPOSE INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 This chapter describes the types of audits and attestation engagements that government and nongovernment audit organizations perform, conduct and that organizations or arrange to have performed conducted, of government organizations, programs, activities, functions, and funds and of government assistance administered by contractors, nonprofit entities, and other nongovernment entities. This description is not intended to limit or require the types of audits or attestation engagements that may be performed conducted or arranged to be performed. In conducting performing work described below in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS) these types of audits, auditors should follow the applicable standards included and incorporated in the chapters 3 through 8 which follow. This chapter also describes other professional services that audit organizations provide, although these services are not covered by GAGAS.
- **2.2** All audits assignments begin with objectives, and those objectives determine the type of audit work to be performed conducted and the audit standards to be followed.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The term "program" is used to include entities, services, and activities.

The types of audits work, as defined by their objectives that are covered by GAGAS, are classified in these standards as financial audits, attestation engagements, and or performance audits.

2.3 Audits Assignments may have a combination of financial or performance audit objectives that include more than one type of work described in this chapter or may have objectives limited to only some aspects of one audit type of work. Auditors should follow the standards that are applicable to the individual objectives of the audit or attestation engagement. For example, auditors conduct audits of government contracts and grants with private sector organizations, as well as government and nonprofit organizations, that often include both financial and performance objectives. These are commonly referred to as "contract audits" or "grant audits." Other, examples of such audits include, audits of specific internal controls, compliance, and computer-based systems.

#### FINANCIAL AUDITS

- 2.4 Financial audits include financial statement and financial related audits.
- **2.4a.** Financial statement audits *primarily concern* provide*ing* reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements of an audited entity *are* presented fairly *in all material respects* the financial position, results of operations, and cash flows in

conformity with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP)..., or Financial statement audits also include audits of financial statements prepared in conformity with a comprehensive basis of accounting other than GAAP any of several other bases of accounting discussed in auditing standards issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA). Other objectives of financial audits may include

- a. providing special reports for specified elements, accounts, or items of a financial statement;
- b. reviewing interim financial information or segments of financial statements;
- c. issuing letters for underwriters and certain other requesting parties;
- d. reporting on the processing of transactions by service organizations; and
- e. auditing compliance with regulations relating to governmental financial assistance.
- 2.5 Financial audits are performed under the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' (AICPA) generally accepted auditing standards for field work and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Three authoritative bodies for generally accepted accounting principles are the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB), the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB), and the sponsors of the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board (FASAB). GASB establishes accounting principles and financial reporting standards for state and local government entities. FASB establishes accounting principles and financial reporting standards for nongovernment entities. FASAB promulgates accounting principles and financial reporting standards for the federal government. The sponsors of FASAB—the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Comptroller General—jointly establish accounting principles and financial reporting standards for the federal government, based on recommendations from FASAB.

reporting, as well as the related AICPA Statements on Auditing Standards (SASs) which interpret the standards and provide guidance on conducting such work.<sup>3</sup>

Accordingly, auditors performing financial audits need to be proficient in applying the AICPA standards and guidance contained in the SASs. GAGAS prescribe general standards and additional field work and reporting requirements beyond those provided by the AICPA when performing financial audits. (See chapters 3, 4, and 5 for standards and guidance for auditors performing a financial audit in accordance with GAGAS.)

b. Financial related audits include determining whether (1) financial information is presented in accordance with established or stated criteria, (2) the entity has adhered to specific financial compliance requirements, or (3) the entity's internal control structure over financial reporting and/or safeguarding assets is suitably designed and implemented to achieve the control objectives.

2.5 Financial related audits may, for example, include audits of the following items:

**a.** Segments of financial statements; financial information (for example, statement of revenue and expenses, statement of cash receipts and disbursements, statement of fixed assets); budget requests; and variances between estimated and actual financial performance.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> GAGAS incorporate all AICPA field work and reporting auditing standards and the related SASs unless the General Accounting Office (GAO) excludes them by formal announcement. To date, GAO has not excluded any AICPA field work or reporting auditing standards or any SASs.

**b.** Internal controls over compliance with laws and regulations, such as those governing the (1) bidding for, (2) accounting for, and (3) reporting on grants and contracts (including proposals, amounts billed, amounts due on termination claims, and so forth).

c. Internal controls over financial reporting and/or safeguarding assets, including controls using computer-based systems.

d. Compliance with laws and regulations and allegations of fraud.

## ATTESTATION ENGAGEMENTS

2.6 Attestation engagements concern examining, reviewing, or performing agreed upon procedures on a subject matter or an assertion<sup>4</sup> about a subject matter and reporting on the results. The subject matter of an attestation engagement may take many forms, including historical or prospective performance or condition, physical characteristics, historical events, analyses, systems and processes, or behavior.

Attestation engagements can cover a broad range of financial or nonfinancial objectives and can be part of a financial audit or other type of audit. Examples of objectives of attestation engagements include reporting on

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> An assertion is any declaration or set of declarations about whether the subject matter is based on or in conformity with the criteria selected.

a.	an entity's internal control over financial reporting;
	an entity's compliance with requirements of specified laws, regulations, rules, ntracts, or grants;
re	the effectiveness of an entity's internal control over compliance with specified quirements, such as those governing the bidding for, accounting for, and reporting grants and contracts;
d.	management's discussion and analysis (MD&A) presentation;
e.	prospective financial statements or pro forma financial information;
f.	the reliability of performance measures;
g.	final contract cost; and
h.	allowability and reasonableness of proposed contract amounts. 5
	7 Attestation engagements are performed under the AICPA's attestation standards, well as the related AICPA Statements on Standards for Attestation Engagements
5 5	ome of these examples of attestation engagement objectives are similar to some of the performance

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Some of these examples of attestation engagement objectives are similar to some of the performance audit objectives listed in paragraphs 2.9 through 2.11. Depending on user needs and the auditor's qualifications, the auditor may choose to apply performance audit standards in chapters 7 and 8 to the objectives in paragraph 2.6 instead of following the attestation standards in chapter 6.

(SSAEs) which interpret the standards and provide guidance on conducting such work. Accordingly, auditors performing attestation engagements need to be proficient in applying the AICPA standards and guidance contained in the SSAEs. GAGAS prescribes general standards and additional field work and reporting requirements beyond those provided by the AICPA for attestation engagements. (See chapters 3 and 6 for standards and guidance for auditors performing an attestation engagement in accordance with GAGAS.)

## PERFORMANCE AUDITS

2.8 A performance audit is an objective and systematic examination of evidence for the purpose of to provide an independent assessment of the performance and management of a government organization an program, activity, or function against objective criteria or an assessment of best practices and other information.

Performance audits in order to provide information to improve program operations public accountability and facilitate decision-making by parties with responsibility to oversee or initiate corrective action, and improve public accountability. Performance audits encompass a wide variety of objectives including objectives related to assessing

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> GAGAS incorporate the AICPA's general attestation standard on criteria and all the AICPA's field work and reporting attestation standards and the related SSAEs unless the Comptroller General of the United States excludes them by formal announcement. To date, the Comptroller General has not excluded any AICPA field work or reporting attestation standards or SSAEs.

program effectiveness and results; economy and efficiency; internal control; and compliance with legal or other requirements; and objectives related to providing prospective analyses, guidance, or summary information. Performance audits also may encompass a broad or narrow scope of work and a variety of methodologies; involve a level of analysis, research, or evaluation; generally provide conclusions and recommendations; and result in a report. (See chapters 3, 7, and 8 for standards and guidance for auditors performing a performance audit in accordance with GAGAS.)

- 2.9 Program effectiveness and results audit objectives address the effectiveness of a program and typically measure the extent to which a program is achieving its goals and objectives. Economy and efficiency audit objectives concern whether an entity is acquiring, protecting, and using its resources in the most productive manner to achieve program objectives. These audit objectives are often interrelated and may be concurrently addressed in a performance audit. Examples of program effectiveness and results and economy and efficiency audit objectives include assessing
- a. the extent to which legislative, regulatory, or organizational goals and objectives are being achieved;
- b. the relative utility of alternative approaches to yield better program performance or eliminate factors that inhibit program effectiveness;

8

.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> The term internal control in this document is synonymous with the term management control and, unless otherwise stated, covers all aspects of an entity's operations (programmatic, financial, and compliance).

- c. the relative cost and benefits or cost effectiveness of program performance;8
- d. whether a program produced intended results or produced effects that were not intended by the program's established or stated objectives;
- e. the extent to which programs duplicate, overlap, or conflict with other related programs;
- f. whether the audited entity is following sound procurement practices;
- g. the validity and reliability of performance measures concerning program effectiveness and results, or economy and efficiency; and
- h. the financial information related to the performance of a program.
- 2.10 Internal control audit objectives relate to management's plans, methods, and procedures used to meet its mission, goals, and objectives. Internal controls include the processes and procedures for planning, organizing, directing, and controlling program operations, and the system put in place for measuring, reporting, and monitoring program performance. Examples of audit objectives related to internal

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> These objectives focus on combining cost information with information about outputs or the benefit provided, and outcomes or the results achieved.

control include the extent that internal controls of a program provide reasonable assurance that

- a. organizational missions, goals, and objectives are achieved effectively and efficiently;
- b. resources are used in compliance with laws, regulations, or other requirements;
- c. resources are safeguarded against unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition;
- d. management information and public reports that are produced, such as performance measures, are complete, accurate, and consistent to document performance and support decision making;
- e. security over computerized information systems will prevent or detect unauthorized access; and
- f. contingency planning for information systems provides essential back-up to prevent unwarranted disruption of activities and functions the systems support.
- 2.11 Compliance audit objectives relate to compliance criteria established by laws, regulations, contract provisions, grant agreements, and other requirements that could affect the acquisition, protection, and use of the entity's resources, and the quantity,

quality, timeliness, and cost of services the entity produces and delivers. Compliance objectives also concern the purpose of the program, the manner in which it is to be conducted and services delivered, and the population it serves.

2.12 Audit organizations are increasingly undertaking work that is similar to the traditional performance audit but may have a prospective focus or may provide guidance, best practice information, or information on cross-cutting issues already studied or under study by an audit organization. While this work generally does not involve assessing specific ongoing programs, it may use data from relevant audit work for comparative or baseline purposes. This performance-related work may encompass a broad or narrow range of objectives and scope of work; use a variety of methodologies; involve a level of analysis, research, or evaluation; generally provide conclusions and recommendations; and result in a report. It is also subject to the same standards as performance audits. Examples of objectives pertaining to this work include

a. assessing program or policy alternatives, including forecasting program outcomes under various assumptions;

b. assessing the advantages and disadvantages of legislative proposals;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Compliance requirements can be either financial or nonfinancial in nature.

- c. conducting surveys to obtain and analyze views of stakeholders on policy proposals for decision makers;
- d. analyzing budget proposals or budget requests to assist legislatures in the budget process;
- e. developing methods or approaches for use in evaluating new or proposed programs;
- f. producing a high-level summary or a report that affects multiple programs or entities on issues studied or under study by the audit organization; and
- g. developing guidance documents such as those based on best practices research and syntheses for management's use in evaluating program or management system approaches, including financial and information management systems.<sup>10</sup>
- 2.7 Performance audits include economy and efficiency and program audits.
- **a.** Economy and efficiency audits include determining (1) whether the entity is acquiring, protecting, and using its resources (such as personnel, property, and space) economically and efficiently, (2) the causes of inefficiencies or uneconomical practices,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> These guidance documents may also be used by auditors in planning and performing their work.

and (3) whether the entity has complied with laws and regulations on matters of economy							
and efficiency.							
<b>b.</b> program audits include determining (1) the extent to which the desired results or							
benefits established by the legislature or other authorizing body are being achieved, (2)							
the effectiveness of organizations, programs, activities, or functions, and (3) whether the							
entity has complied with significant laws and regulations applicable to the program.							
2.8 Economy and efficiency audits may, for example, consider whether the entity							
a. is following sound procurement practices;							
b. is acquiring the appropriate type, quality, and amount of resources at an appropriate							
<del>cost;</del>							
e. is properly protecting and maintaining its resources;							
d. is avoiding duplication of effort by employees and work that serves little or no							
<del>purpose;</del>							
e. is avoiding idleness and overstaffing;							
f. is using efficient operating procedures;							

g. is using the optimum amount of resources (staff, equipment, and facilities) in producing or delivering the appropriate quantity and quality of goods or services in a timely manner;

**h.** is complying with requirements of laws and regulations that could significantly affect the acquisition, protection, and use of the entity's resources;

i. has an adequate management control system for measuring, reporting, and monitoring a program's economy and efficiency; and

j. has reported measures of economy and efficiency that are valid and reliable.

2.9 Program audits<sup>11</sup> may, for example

**a.** assess whether the objectives of a new, or ongoing program are proper, suitable, or relevant;

**b.** determine the extent to which a program achieves a desired level of program results;

**e.** assess the effectiveness of the program and/or of individual program components;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> These audits may apply to services, activities, and functions as well as programs.

d. identify factors inhibiting satisfactory performance;
e. determine whether management has considered alternatives for carrying out the
program that might yield desired results more effectively or at a lower cost;
f. determine whether the program complements, duplicates, overlaps, or conflicts with
other related programs;
g. identify ways of making programs work better;
h. assess compliance with laws and regulations applicable to the program;
i. assess the adequacy of the management control system for measuring, reporting, and
monitoring a program's effectiveness; and
j. determine whether management has reported measures of program effectiveness that
are valid and reliable.
OTHER ACTIVITIES NONAUDIT SERVICES OF AN AUDIT ORGANIZATIONS
2.13 Audit organizations may also provide nonaudit services that are not covered by
GAGAS. These nonaudit services consist of gathering, providing, or explaining
information requested by decision makers or providing advice or assistance to

management officials. Nonaudit services generally differ from financial audits, attestation engagements, and performance audits described above in that auditors provide information or data to a requesting party without providing verification, analysis, or evaluation of the information or data, and therefore the work does not usually provide a basis for conclusions, recommendations, or opinions on the information or data. These other services may or may not result in a report. Some examples of these other professional services include

a. assisting a legislative body by developing questions for use at a hearing;

b. gathering and reporting unverified external or third-party data to aid legislative and administrative decision making;

c. compiling or reviewing financial statements or other information to assist entities and management officials; 12

d. advising an entity regarding its performance of internal control self-assessments;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> This type of work is covered under the AICPA's Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services (SSARS), which are not incorporated into GAGAS since the work covered by the SSARS are not considered audits.

e. providing professional advice to entities and management officials to assist them in activities such as the design or installation of information systems and related internal control activities;

f. valuing an entity's pension, other postemployment benefit, or other similar liabilities;

g. preparing an entity's indirect cost proposal or cost allocation plan;

h. providing human resource services to assist management in its evaluation of potential candidates; and

i. development of audit methodologies, policies, and procedures.

2.11 2.14 GAGAS do not cover nonaudit services described in this chapter as such services are not audits or attestation engagements. Therefore, auditors should not report that such services were conducted in accordance with GAGAS. However, The head of the audit organizations are encouraged may wish to establish policies for maintaining the quality of this type of work, and may wish to disclose in any product resulting from this work, any other professional standards followed and the quality control steps taken. applying standards in this statement to its employees are is performing these and other types of nonaudit work

2.10 Auditors may perform services other than audits. For example, some auditors may

	•	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1	•		C .	
		lagiclativa						
а.	assist a	<u>icgisiative</u>	bouy b	y deven	oping q	ucstions	ioi use ai	mearings,

**b.** develop methods and approaches to be applied in evaluating a new or a proposed program,

**c.** forecast potential program outcomes under various assumptions without evaluating eurrent operations, and

**d.** perform investigative work.

## CHAPTER 3

#### GENERAL STANDARDS

## **PURPOSEINTRODUCTION**

3.1 This chapter prescribes general standards and provides guidance for performing conducting financial audits, attestation engagements, and performance audits. These general standards concern the fundamental requirements for ensuring the credibility of auditors' results. Credibility is essential to all audit organizations performing work that government leaders and other users rely on for making decisions, and is what the public expects of information provided by auditors. These general standards encompass the independence of the audit organization and its individual auditors; the exercise of professional judgment in the performance of work and the preparation of related reports; the competence of audit staff, including their continuing professional education; and the existence of quality control systems and external peer reviews. These general standards relate to the qualifications of the staff, the audit organization's and the individual auditor's independence, the exercise of due professional care in conducting the audit and in preparing related reports, and the presence of quality controls. General standards are distinct from those standards that relate to conducting field work and preparing related reports.

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See chapter 6 for an additional general standard auditors should follow when performing an attestation engagement.

3.2 These general standards provide the underlying framework that is critical in effectively applying more specific *the* field work and reporting standards, described in the following chapters, in performing the detailed work associated with the assignment, and in preparing related reports and other products. Therefore, tThese general standards apply to are required to be followed by all auditors and audit organizations, both government and nongovernment, (for example, public accounting firms and consulting firms), conducting audits of government organizations, programs, activities, and functions, and of government assistance received by nongovernment organizations. performing work under *generally accepted government auditing standards* (GAGAS).

## **INDEPENDENCE**

[Refer to Independence exposure draft. The following paragraph numbers will change accordingly.]

# PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT

3.3 3.26 The third second general standard is:

Professional judgment due professional care should be used in planning and performing conducting audits and attestation engagements, and in reporting the results preparing related reports.

3.4 3.27 This standard requires auditors to observe the principles of serving the public interest and maintaining the highest sense of integrity, objectivity, and independence in applying professional judgment<sup>2</sup> in all aspects of their work. This standard requires auditors to use professional judgment in all aspects of their work, with due professional care. Due care and This standard also imposes a responsibility upon each auditor within the audit organization to observe generally accepted government auditing standards GAGAS. If auditors hold themselves out as following GAGAS, regardless of whether they are required to follow such standards, they need to justify any departures from them.

3.5 3.28 Exercising due professional care means using Auditors should use sound professional judgment in determining the type of assignment to be performed and the standards that apply to the work; in establishing the scope of work; selecting the methodology; determining the type and amount of evidence to be gathered; and choosing the tests and procedures for their audit work. The same sound Professional judgment also should be applied in conducting performing the tests and procedures and in evaluating and reporting the audit results of the work.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Professional judgment is synonymous with due professional care as defined in the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) standards. While the principles of serving the public interest and maintaining the highest sense of integrity, objectivity, and independence are not explicitly stated in the AICPA's due professional care standard, these principles serve as the framework for all AICPA rules and standards.

- 3.29 Auditors should use sound professional judgment in determining the standards that apply to the work to be conducted. The auditors' determination that certain standards do not apply to the audit should be documented in the working papers. Situations may occur in which government auditors are not able to follow an applicable standard and are not able to withdraw from the audit. In those situations, the auditors should disclose in the scope section of their report, the fact that an applicable standard was not followed, the reasons therefor, and the known effect that not following the standard had on the results of the audit.
- 3.6 Professional judgment requires auditors to exercise professional skepticism, which is an attitude that includes a questioning mind and a critical assessment of evidence. Auditors use the knowledge, skills, and experience called for by their profession to diligently perform, in good faith and with integrity, the gathering of evidence and objective evaluation of the competency and sufficiency of evidence. Since evidence is gathered and evaluated throughout the assignment, professional skepticism should be exercised throughout the assignment.
- 3.7 Auditors neither assume that management is dishonest nor assume unquestioned honesty. In exercising professional skepticism, auditors should not be satisfied with less than persuasive evidence because of a belief that management is honest.

3.8 The exercise of professional judgment allows the auditor to obtain reasonable assurance that material misstatements or significant inaccuracies in data will be detected if they exist. Absolute assurance is not attainable because of the nature of evidence and the characteristics of fraud. Therefore, an audit or attestation engagement conducted in accordance with GAGAS may not detect a material misstatement or significant inaccuracy, whether from error or fraud. Accordingly, 3.30 wWhile this standard places responsibility on each auditor and audit organization to exercise professional judgment due professional care in the planning and performingance of an audit assignment, it does not imply unlimited responsibility, neither nor does it imply infallibility on the part of either the individual auditor or the audit organization.

# **COMPETENCE QUALIFICATIONS**

3.9 3.3 The first third general standard is:

The staff assigned to conduct perform the assignment audit should collectively possess adequate professional competence proficiency for the tasks required.

3.10 3.4 This standard places responsibility on the audit organizations to ensure that each assignment audit is conducted performed by staff who collectively have the knowledge, and skills, and experience necessary for that assignment audit. Audit organizations should have a process, such as a human capital system, for

recruitment, hiring, continuous development, and evaluation of staff to assist the organization in maintaining a workforce that has adequate competence. They should also have a thorough knowledge of government auditing and of the specific or unique environment in which the audited entity operates, relative to the nature of the audit being conducted.

3.11 3.5 The qualifications mentioned here competencies discussed below apply to the knowledge, and skills, and experience of the audit organizations as a whole and not necessarily to each individual auditor. An organization may need to employ personnel individuals or hire subject matter experts outside consultants who are knowledgeable, skilled, or experienced in such areas as accounting, statistics, law, engineering, audit design and methodology, information technology automated data processing, public administration, economics, social sciences, or actuarial science.

# Technical Knowledge and Competence Staff Qualifications

3.12 3.10 Qualifications for sStaff members conducting audits and attestation engagements under GAGAS include should collectively possess the technical knowledge, skills, and experience necessary to be competent for the type of work being performed before beginning work on an assignment. Auditors should possess

a. knowledge of government auditing standards applicable to the type of work they are assigned knowledge of the methods and techniques applicable to government

auditing and the education, skills, and experience to apply such knowledge to the work audit being performed conducted;

- b. knowledge of the specific environment in which the audited entity operates and the subject matter under review;
- **b.** Knowledge of government organizations, programs, activities, and functions.
- **c.** So kills to communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing-; and
- **d.** Sokills appropriate for the audit work being *performed* conducted. For *example*: instance
  - (1) if the work requires use of statistical sampling, the staff or consultants to the staff should include persons with statistical sampling *expertise* skills;
  - (2) if the work requires extensive review of computerized *information* systems, the staff or consultants to the staff should include persons with computer audit *information technology expertise* skills;
  - (3) if the work involves review of complex engineering data, the staff or consultants to the staff should include persons with engineering skills *expertise*; or

- (4) if the work involves the use of nontraditional specialized audit methodologies or analytical techniques, such as the use of complex survey instruments, actuarial-based estimates, or statistical analysis tests, the staff or consultants to the staff should include persons with expertise skills in those methodologies.
- 3.13e. The following qualifications additional competencies are needed for financial audits that lead to an expression of an opinion..:
- (1)a. The Aauditors should be knowledgeable proficient in the appropriate accounting principles and in government auditing standards generally accepted accounting principles and the AICPA's generally accepted auditing standards for field work and reporting and the related statements on the standards (SASs) when performing a financial audit and should be competent in applying these standards and SASs to the task assigned. Similarly, when performing an attestation engagement, auditors should be knowledgeable in the AICPA's general attestation standard related to criteria, and the AICPA's attestation standards for field work and reporting and the related statements on the standards for attestation engagements (SSAEs), and should be competent in applying these standards and SSAEs to the task assigned.
- (2)b. The Ppublic accountants engaged to perform eonduct financial audits or attestation engagements should be (a) licensed certified public accountants or persons working for a licensed certified public accounting firm, or (b) public

accountants licensed on or before December 31, 1970, or persons working for a public accounting firm licensed on or before December 31, 1970.<sup>3</sup>

# Continuing *Professional* Education Requirements

3.14 3.6 To meet this standard, the audit organization should have a program to ensure that its staff Auditors performing work under GAGAS need to maintain their professional competence proficiency through continuing professional education (CPE) and training. Thus Therefore, each auditor responsible for planning, directing, conducting, or reporting on performing work audits under GAGAS these standards should complete, every 2 years, at least 80 hours of continuing education and training CPE which directly contributes to the auditor's professional proficiency to perform such work. At least 20 hours should be completed in any 1 year of the 2-year period.

3.15 3.8 The eContinuing education and training may include such topics as eurrent developments in audit standards and methodology, accounting, assessment of internal controls, principles of management or supervision, financial, information systems management, statistical sampling, financial statement analysis, evaluation design, and data analysis. It may also include subjects related to the auditor's specific fields of work, such as public administration, public policy and structure, industrial

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Accountants and accounting firms meeting these licensing requirements should also comply with the applicable provisions of the public accountancy law and rules of the jurisdiction(s) where the audit is being conducted and the jurisdiction(s) in which the accountants and their firms are licensed.

engineering, *finance*, economics, social sciences, of and information technology computer science.

3.16 In addition, auditors Individuals responsible for planning or directing an assignment audit, performing conducting substantial portions of the field work, or reporting on the assignment audit under GAGAS these standards should complete at least 24 of the 80 hours of continuing education and training CPE in subjects directly related to the government environment and to government auditing. If the audited entity operates in a specific or unique environment, auditors should receive training CPE that is related to that environment.

3.17 3.7 The audit organization is responsible for establishing and implementing program to ensuringe that auditors meet the continuing education and training requirements just stated. The audit organization should maintain documentation of the education and training CPE completed. GAO has developed guidance pertaining to CPE requirements to assist auditors and audit organizations in exercising professional judgment in complying with the CPE requirements...

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Auditors are considered responsible for "conducting substantial portions of field work" when, in a given CPE year, time chargeable to audits and attestation engagements following GAGAS is 20 percent or more of their total chargeable time.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The qualifications standards and continuing education requirements place responsibilities on both the audit organization and individual auditors. Carrying out these responsibilities requires sound professional judgment. To assist audit organizations and individual auditors in exercising that judgment, the General Accounting Office (GAO) issued <u>Interpretation of Continuing Education and Training Requirements</u>, April 1991, Government Printing Office stock number 020-000-00250-6.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> <u>Interpretation of Continuing Education and Training Requirements</u>, April 1991, Government Printing Office stock number 020-000-00250-6.

3.18 3.9 External consultants and internal experts and specialists should be qualified and maintain professional competence proficiency in their areas of expertise and/or specialization. However, they but are not required to meet the above CPE continuing education and training requirements unless they are responsible for following GAGAS in planning or directing the assignment, performing substantial portions of field work, or reporting on the assignment. Auditors performing nonaudit activities and services also are not required to meet the above continuing education and training requirements.

# QUALITY CONTROL AND ASSURANCE

3.19 3.31 The fourth general standard is:

Each audit organization performing eonducting assignments audits in accordance with GAGAS these standards should have an appropriate internal quality control system in place and should undergo an external quality control peer review.

3.20 3.32 The internal quality control system established by the audit organization should provide reasonable assurance that it *is following* (1) has established, and is following adequate *quality control* audit-related policies and procedures, *and* (2) has adopted, and is following, applicable *government* auditing standards. *The internal* 

quality control system should include procedures for monitoring, on an ongoing basis, whether the policies and procedures related to the standards are suitably designed and are being effectively applied.

3.21 3.32 The nature and extent of an *audit* organization's internal quality control system depends on a number of factors, such as its size, the degree of operating autonomy allowed its personnel and its audit offices, the nature of its work, its organizational structure, and appropriate cost-benefit considerations. Thus, the systems established by individual organizations will vary as will the *need for, and* extent of, their documentation *of the systems*. *However*, *each organization should prepare appropriate documentation to demonstrate compliance with its policies and procedures for its system of quality control*.

3.22 3.33 Audit Oorganizations conducting performing assignments audits in accordance with GAGAS these standards should have an external quality control peer review conducted at least once every 3 years by reviewers an organization not affiliated with independent of the organization being reviewed. The external quality control peer review should determine whether the organization's internal quality control system is in place and operating effectively to provide reasonable assurance

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Audit organizations should have an external quality control peer review completed (that is, report issued) conducted within 3 years from the date they start (that is, start of field work) their first assignment audit in accordance with GAGAS these standards. Subsequent external control peer reviews should be conducted every 3 years completed within 3 years after the issuance of the prior review. Audit organizations should generally maintain their review year from review to review. Any extensions of these time frames to meet the external peer review requirements can only be granted by GAO and should only be requested for extraordinary circumstances.

that established policies and procedures and applicable *government* auditing standards are being followed.

- 3.23 3.34 An external quality control peer review under this standard should meet the following requirements-8:
- a. Reviewers should be qualified and have current knowledge of the type of work to be reviewed and the applicable auditing standards. For example, *I* individuals conducting peer reviews of an audit organization's system of quality control reviewing government audits should have a thorough knowledge of *GAGAS* and of the government environment and government auditing relative to the work being reviewed.
- b. Reviewers should be independent (as defined in GAGAS these standards) of the audit organization being reviewed, its staff, and its auditees whose the assignments audits are selected for review. An audit organization is not permitted to review the organization that conducted its most recent external quality control peer review.

  Also, the employing organization of the peer reviewers should have received an unqualified opinion on the review of their organization's system of quality controls.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>External quality control reviews conducted through or by the AICPA, National State Auditors
Association, National Association of Local Government Auditors, President's Council on Integrity and
Efficiency, Executive Council on Integrity and Efficiency, and Institute of Internal Auditors meet these requirements.

- c. Reviewers should have knowledge and training on how to perform a peer review and should use sound professional judgment in conducting and reporting the results of the external quality control review.
- d. This review should include a review of the *organization's internal quality control policies and procedures*, audit reports, working papers audit documentation, and other necessary documents (for example, *independence statements*, outside employment requests, financial disclosure reports, correspondence and continuing education CPE documentation). The review should also include contacts as well as interviews with various levels of the reviewed organization's professional staff to assess their understanding of and compliance with relevant quality control policies and procedures.
- e. Reviewers should use one of the following approaches to selecting assignments audits for review: (1) select assignments audits that provide a reasonable cross section of the assignments audits performed conducted by the reviewed organization in accordance with GAGAS these standards or (2) select assignments audits that provide a reasonable cross section of the reviewed organization's work subject to quality control requirements audits, including one or more assignments audits performed conducted in accordance with GAGAS these standards.
- f. The review should be sufficiently comprehensive to provide a reasonable basis for concluding whether the reviewed audit organization's system of quality control was complied with to provide the organization with reasonable assurance of

conforming with professional standards in the conduct of its work. Reviewers may scale back the peer review procedures based on the reviewers' evaluation of the adequacy and results of the reviewed organization's monitoring efforts.

- g. f. Reviewers should prepare a A written report(s) should be prepared communicating the results of the external quality control peer review. The report should indicate the scope of the review, including any limitations thereon, and should express an opinion on whether the system of quality control of the reviewed organization was in place and operating effectively to provide reasonable assurance that established policies and procedures and applicable government auditing standards are followed. The report should also describe the reason(s) for any modifications to the opinion. When there are matters that resulted in a modification to the standard report, reviewers should report a detailed description of the findings and recommendations to enable the reviewed organization to take appropriate actions. To help users of the peer review report understand the peer review process, each report should be accompanied by an attachment describing the process, including how peer reviews are planned and performed.
- 3.35 External quality control review procedures should be tailored to the size and nature of an organization's audit work. For example, an organization that performs only a few audits may be more effectively reviewed by emphasizing a review of the quality of those audits rather than the organization's internal quality control policies and procedures.

3.24 3.36 Audit organizations seeking to enter into a contract to perform an audit assignment in accordance with GAGAS these standards should provide their most recent external quality control peer review report to the party contracting for the audit or attestation engagement. Information in the external quality control peer review report often would be relevant to decisions on procuring audit or attestation engagement services.

3.25 3.36 Auditors who are relying on another audit organization's work should request a copy of the audit organization's peer review report, and the audit organization should provide the peer review report when requested. Audit organizations also should transmit their external peer review reports to appropriate oversight bodies. make their external quality control review reports available to auditors using their work and to appropriate oversight bodies. It is also recommended that the report be made available to the public in a timely manner.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>The term "report" does not include separate letters of comment.

## CHAPTER 4

# FIELD WORK STANDARDS FOR FINANCIAL AUDITS

## **PURPOSE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

- 4.1 This chapter prescribes standards of field work for financial audits, which include financial statement audits and financial related audits. Generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS) incorporate the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' (AICPA) generally accepted field work standards for audits and the related AICPA Statements on Auditing Standards (SASs) unless the Comptroller General of the United States excludes them by formal announcement. This chapter identifies the AICPA field work standards and prescribes additional standards for applying the AICPA field work standards for financial audits performed in accordance with GAGAS. This chapter concludes with guidance that auditors should give consideration to when performing financial audits in accordance with GAGAS.
- 4.2 Financial audits consist of all work performed under the AICPA's generally accepted auditing standards and governed by the AICPA SASs, which interpret the standards. Such work

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> To date, the Comptroller General has not excluded any field work standards or statements on auditing standards.

performed in a government environment primarily includes audits of financial statements. The SASs also govern other types of services which may also be performed in a government environment, such as compliance auditing, issuing special reports,<sup>3</sup> audits of service organizations, reviews of interim financial information, and issuing letters to underwriters and certain other requesting parties. These other services may be performed in conjunction with an audit of financial statements.

## RELATION TO AICPA FIELD WORK STANDARDS

4.3 4.2 For financial statement audits, generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS) incorporate the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' (AICPA) The three AICPA generally accepted standards of field work, which are as follows.

a. The work is to be adequately planned, and assistants, if any, are to be properly supervised.

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The term "financial statement" refers to a presentation of financial data, including accompanying notes, derived from accounting records and intended to communicate an entity's economic resources or obligations at a point in time or the changes therein for a period of time in conformity with an identifiable framework, such as generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) or an other comprehensive basis of accounting (OCBOA). Audits of financial statements include all services governed by the AICPA's SASs for which the auditors are engaged to provide a level of assurance on the fair presentation of financial statements in accordance with a stated criteria.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Special reports apply to auditors' reports issued in connection with the following: (1) financial statements that are prepared in conformity with a comprehensive basis of accounting other than generally accepted accounting principles; (2) specified elements, accounts, or items of a financial statement; (3) compliance with aspects of contractual agreements or regulatory requirements related to audited financial statements; (4) financial presentations to comply with contractual agreements or regulatory provisions; or (5) financial information presented in prescribed forms or schedules that require a prescribed form of auditor's report.

- b. A sufficient understanding of internal control is to be obtained to plan the audit and to determine the nature, timing, and extent of tests to be performed.
- c. Sufficient competent evidential matter is to be obtained through inspection, observation, inquiries, and confirmations to afford a reasonable basis for an opinion regarding the financial statements under audit.
- **4.3** The AICPA has issued statements on auditing standards (SAS)<sup>-1</sup> that interpret its standards of field work (including a SAS on compliance auditing). This chapter incorporates these SASs and prescribes additional standards on
- a. auditor communication (see paragraphs 4.6.3 through 4.6.9),
- **b.** audit follow-up (see paragraphs 4.7, 4.10, and 4.11),
- c. noncompliance other than illegal acts (see paragraphs 4.13 and 4.18 through 4.20),
- **d.** documentation requirements when assessing control risk at maximum for controls significantly dependent upon computerized information systems (see paragraphs 4.21.1 through 4.21.4), and
- e. working papers. (See paragraphs 4.34 through 4.38.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup> GAGAS incorporate any new AICPA field work standards relevant to financial statement audits unless the General Accounting Office (GAO) excludes them by formal announcement..

4.4 This chapter also discusses three other key aspects of financial statement audits:
a. materiality (see paragraphs 4.6.1 and 4.6.2),
<b>b.</b> fraud and illegal acts (see paragraphs 4.14 through 4.17), and
c. internal control. (See paragraphs 4.22 and 4.25 through 4.30.)
4.5 This chapter concludes by explaining which standards auditors should follow in performing financial related audits.
ADDITIONAL GAGAS FIELD WORK STANDARDS
4.4 GAGAS prescribe additional standards for applying the AICPA three generally accepted AICPA field work standards which go beyond the requirements contained in the AICPA's SASs. Auditors must comply with these additional standards when citing GAGAS in their audit reports. The additional GAGAS relate to
a. auditor communication (see paragraphs 4.6 through 4.13),
b. considering the results of previous audits (see paragraphs 4.14 through 4.16),  4

## **Auditor Communication**

#### **AUDITOR COMMUNICATION**

**4.6 4.6.3** The first *An* additional *standard related to auditor communication* planning standard for financial statement audits *performed in accordance with GAGAS* is:

Auditors should communicate information regarding the nature of services and level of assurance provided to the auditee not only officials of the audited entity, but also to the individuals contracting for or requesting the audit services, and the audit committee or other equivalent oversight body regarding the nature and extent of planned testing and reporting on compliance with laws and regulations and internal control over financial reporting.

4.7 4.6.4 AICPA standards and GAGAS require auditors to establish an understanding with the client and to communicate with audit committees. GAGAS broaden who the parties with whom auditors must communicate with and requires auditors to communicate specific information regarding the nature and extent of testing and reporting on compliance with laws and regulations and internal control over financial reporting during the planning stages of a financial statement audit to reduce the risk that the needs or expectations of the parties involved may be misinterpreted.

Auditors should use their professional judgment to determine the form, content, and frequency of the communication, although written communication is preferred, and should document the communication. Auditors may use an engagement letter, if appropriate, to communicate the information.

4.8 4.6.5 The auditee is the organization or entity being audited. Auditors should communicate their responsibilities for the engagement to the appropriate officials of the auditee audited entity, (which would normally may include

a. the head of the organization audited entity,

**b.** the audit committee or board of directors or other equivalent oversight body in the absence of an audit committee, and

c. the individual who possesses a sufficient level of authority and responsibility for the financial reporting process, such as the chief financial officer).

4.9 In situations where auditors are performing the audit under a contract with a party other than the auditee officials of the audited entity, or pursuant to a third-party request, auditors should also communicate with the individuals contracting for or requesting the audit, such as contracting officials or legislative members or staff. When auditors are performing the audit pursuant to a law or regulation, auditors should communicate with the legislative members or staff who have oversight of the auditee. Auditors should coordinate communications with the responsible government

This requirement applies only to situations where the law or regulation specifically identifies the entity to be audited, such as an audit of a specific agency's financial statements required by the Chief Financial Officers Act, as expanded by the Government Management Reform Act of 1994. Situations where the *audit of* financial *statements* audit mandate applies to entities not specifically identified, such as audits required by the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996, are excluded.

audit organization and/or management of the audited entity, and may use the engagement letter to keep interested parties informed.

4.10 4.6.6 In communicating the nature of services and level of assurance provided, auditors should specifically address their planned work related to testing compliance with laws and regulations and internal control over financial reporting. During the planning stages of an audit, auditors should communicate their responsibilities in a financial statement audit, including their responsibilities for testing and reporting on compliance with laws and regulations and internal control over financial reporting. Such communication should include the nature of any additional testing of compliance and internal control required by laws and regulations or otherwise requested, and whether the auditors are planning on providing opinions on compliance with laws and regulations and internal control over financial reporting.

4.11 4.6.7 Auditors should use their professional judgment to determine the form and content of the communication. Written communication is preferred. Auditors should document the communication in the working papers. Auditors may use an engagement letter to communicate the information described in paragraph 4.6.6. To assist in understanding the limitations of auditors' responsibilities for testing and reporting on compliance and internal control over financial reporting, auditors may want to contrast those responsibilities with other financial audits of compliance and controls. The discussion in paragraphs 4.12 4.6.8 and 4.13 4.6.9 may be helpful to auditors in explaining their responsibilities for testing and reporting on compliance with laws and regulations and internal control over financial reporting to the auditee officials of the audited entity and other interested parties.

4.12 4.6.8 Tests of compliance with laws and regulations and internal control over financial reporting in a financial statement audit contribute to the evidence supporting the auditors' opinion on the financial statements or other conclusions regarding financial data. However, they such tests generally do not provide a basis for opining are not sufficient in scope to opine on compliance or internal control over financial reporting. To meet certain audit report users' needs, laws and regulations sometimes prescribe testing and reporting on compliance and internal control over financial reporting to supplement the financial statement audit's coverage of these areas. 1.25

**4.13 4.6.9** Even after auditors perform and report the results of additional tests of compliance and internal control over financial reporting required by laws and regulations, some reasonable needs of report users still may be unmet. Auditors may meet these needs by performing further tests of compliance and internal control in either of two ways:

- a. supplemental (or agreed-upon) procedures or
- **b.** examination, resulting in an opinion.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> +2 For example, when engaged to perform audits under the Single Audit Act *Amendments of 1996 for of* state and local government entities and nonprofit organizations *entities* that receive federal awards, auditors should be familiar with the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133 *on single audits*. The act and circular include specific audit requirements, mainly in the areas of compliance with laws and regulations and internal control, that exceed the minimum audit requirements in the standards in chapters 4 and 5 of this document. Audits conducted under the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, as expanded by the Government Management Reform Act of 1994, also have specific audit requirements prescribed by OMB in the areas of compliance and internal control. Many state and local governments have additional audit requirements.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Such work is generally performed under the AICPA's Statements on Standards for Attestation Engagements. See chapter 6 for a discussion of the standards used when performing attestation engagements.

## Audit Follow-up

## **CONSIDERING THE RESULTS**

# **OF PREVIOUS AUDITS**

4.14 4.7 The second An additional standard planning standard for financial statement audits performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

Auditors should consider the results of previous audits and follow up on known significant material findings and recommendations, including those related to reportable conditions, identified in from previous audits reports that relate to the objectives of the audit being undertaken.

[Paragraphs 4.8 and 4.9 have been moved and renumbered to paragraphs 4.6.1 and 4.6.2.]

4.15 4.10 Auditors should follow up on known material findings and recommendations from previous audits that could affect the financial statement audit. Auditors They should do this perform such follow up to determine whether the auditee has officials of the audited entity have taken timely and appropriate corrective actions. Auditors should report the status of uncorrected material findings and recommendations from prior audits that affect the financial statements. In addition to following up on significant reported findings and recommendations from previous financial audits, auditors should consider significant findings identified in attestation engagements, performance

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Significant findings and recommendations are those matters that, if not corrected, could affect the results of the auditors' work and users' conclusions about those results.

audits, or other studies if these findings could materially affect the results of the financial audit. For example, an audit report on an entity's computerized information systems may contain significant findings that could relate to the financial audit if the entity uses such systems to process its accounting information. In any event, auditors need to make judgments about the extent of follow-up needed and the appropriate disclosure of uncorrected significant findings and recommendations from prior audits that affect the audit objectives.

4.16 4.11 Much of the benefit from audit work is not in the findings reported or the recommendations made, but in their effective resolution. Providing continuing attention to significant findings and recommendations is important to ensure that the benefits of audit work are realized. Ultimately, the benefits of audit work occur when audit findings are resolved through meaningful and effective corrective action taken in response to the auditors' findings and recommendations. Auditee management is Officials of the audited entity are responsible for resolving audit findings and recommendations directed to them; and for having a process to track their status can help it fulfill this responsibility. If management does officials of the audited entity do not have such a process, auditors may wish to establish their own process. Continued attention to material findings and recommendations can help auditors assure that the benefits of their work are realized.

## **NONCOMPLIANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF**

# **CONTRACTS AND GRANT AGREEMENTS**

4.17 4.13 The additional standard related to compliance with provisions of contracts and grant agreements standard for financial statement audits performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

Auditors should design the audit to provide reasonable assurance of detecting material misstatements of financial statements or other financial data resulting from noncompliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements that have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. If specific information comes to the auditors' attention that provides evidence concerning the existence of possible noncompliance that could affect financial data significant to the audit objectives or that could have a material indirect effect on the financial statements, auditors should apply audit procedures specifically directed to ascertaining whether that noncompliance has occurred or is likely to have occurred.

4.18 4.12 AICPA standards and GAGAS require the following: a. Auditors should design the audit to provide reasonable assurance of detecting fraud that is material to the financial statements. auditors to assess the risk of material misstatements of financial statements due to

b: [Bolding removed] Auditors should are also required to design the audit to provide reasonable assurance of detecting material misstatements resulting from direct and material illegal acts: and exploiting removed and are also required to design the audit to provide reasonable assurance of detecting material misstatements resulting from direct and material illegal acts: and exploiting removed and additors should to be aware of the possibility that indirect illegal acts may have occurred. If specific information comes to the auditors attention that provides evidence concerning the existence of possible illegal acts that could have a material indirect effect on the financial statements, the auditors should apply audit procedures specifically directed to ascertaining whether an illegal act has occurred. Under GAGAS, the term noncompliance, however, has a broader meaning than fraud and illegal acts. Noncompliance includes not only fraud and illegal acts, but also violations of provisions of contracts or grant agreements.

[Paragraphs 4.14 through 4.17 moved to paragraphs 4.37 through 4.39.]

Noncompliance Other Than Illegal Acts

4.19 4.18 The term noncompliance has a broader meaning than illegal acts. Noncompliance includes not only illegal acts, but also violations of provisions of contracts or grant agreements.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8 2</sup>Two types of misstatements are relevant to the auditors' consideration of fraud in an audit of financial statements audit—misstatements arising from fraudulent financial statements and misstatements arising from misappropriation of assets. The primary factor that distinguishes fraud from error is whether the underlying action that results in the misstatement in the financial statements is intentional or unintentional.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Direct and material illegal acts are violations of laws and regulations having a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Indirect illegal acts are violations of laws and regulations having material but indirect effects on the financial statements.

AICPA standards do not discuss auditors' responsibility for detecting noncompliance other than illegal acts. But, uUnder GAGAS, auditors have the same responsibilities for detecting material misstatements arising from other types of noncompliance as they do for detecting those arising from *fraud and* illegal acts. 4.19 Direct and material noncompliance is noncompliance having a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts or could have a significant effect on other financial data needed to achieve audit objectives. Auditors should design the audit to provide reasonable assurance of detecting material misstatements resulting from direct and material noncompliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements. 4.20 Indirect noncompliance is noncompliance having material but indirect effects on the financial statements or other financial data needed to achieve audit objectives. A financial statement audit provides no assurance that indirect noncompliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements will be detected. However, iIf specific information comes to the auditors' attention that provides evidence concerning the existence of possible noncompliance that could have a material indirect effect on the financial statements or significant indirect effect on other financial data need to achieve audit objectives, auditors should apply audit procedures specifically directed to ascertaining whether that noncompliance has occurred or is likely to have occurred.

[Paragraphs 4.21.1 through 4.21.4 deleted.]

## **WORKING PAPERS**

#### **AUDIT DOCUMENTATION**

4.20 4.35 The An additional standard related to audit documentation working paper standard for financial statement audits performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

Working papers Audit documentation should contain sufficient information to enable an experienced auditor reviewer, who has had having no previous connection with the audit, to ascertain from them the audit documentation the evidence that supports the auditors' significant judgments and conclusions and judgments. Audit documentation that supports significant findings, conclusions, and recommendations should be complete before auditors issue their report.

4.21 4.34 AICPA standards and GAGAS require the following: A record of the auditors' work should be retained in the form of working papers. auditors to prepare and maintain audit documentation. The form and content of audit documentation should be designed to meet the circumstances of the particular audit. The information contained in audit documentation constitutes the principal record of the work that the auditors have performed and the conclusions that the auditors have reached. The quantity, type, and content of audit documentation is a matter of the auditors' professional judgment. 4.36 However, Aaudits done performed in accordance with GAGAS are subject to review by other auditors reviewers and by oversight officials more frequently than audits done in accordance with AICPA standards. Thus, whereas AICPA standards cite two main purposes of working papers audit documentation--providing the principal

support for the audit report and aiding auditors in the conduct performing and supervisiong of the audit--working papers audit documentation serves an additional purpose in audits performed in accordance with GAGAS. Working papers Audit documentation allows for the review of audit quality by providing the reviewer written documentation, either in written or electronic formats, of the evidence supporting the auditors' significant judgments and conclusions and judgments.

4.22 4.37 Working papers Audit documentation for financial audits performed under GAGAS should contain

**a.** the objectives, scope, and methodology, including any sampling and other selection criteria used;

b. documentation of the auditor's determination that certain additional government auditing standards do not apply or that an applicable standard was not followed, the reasons therefor, and the known effect that not following the standard had, or could have, on the audit;

**bc.** documentation of the work performed to support significant *judgments and* conclusions and judgments, including descriptions of transactions and records examined that would enable an experienced auditor *reviewer* to examine the same transactions and records; <sup>69</sup> and

16

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9 6</sup>Auditors may meet this requirement by listing voucher numbers, check numbers, or other means of identifying specific documents they examined. They Auditors are not required to include copies of documents they examined in the working papers as part of the audit documentation, nor are they auditors required to list detailed information from those documents.

d. auditors' basis for assessing control risk at the maximum level for assertions related to material account balances, transaction classes, and disclosure components of financial statements when such assertions are significantly dependent upon computerized information systems by addressing (1) the ineffectiveness of the design and/or operation of the controls, or (2) the reasons why it would be inefficient to test the controls;

e. the consideration that the planned audit procedures are designed to achieve audit objectives when evidential matter obtained is highly dependent on computerized information systems and is material to the audit objective, and the auditors are not relying on the effectiveness of internal control over those computerized systems that produced the information. The audit documentation should specifically address (1) the rationale for determining the nature, timing, and extent of planned audit procedures; (2) the kinds and competence of available evidential matter produced outside a computerized information system; and (3) the effect on the audit report if evidential matter to be gathered does not afford a reasonable basis to achieve the audit objectives; 10 and

**cf.** evidence of supervisory reviews of the work performed.

4.23 4.38 One factor *uU*nderlying GAGAS audits is that federal, state, and local governments and other organizations cooperate in auditing programs of common interest so that auditors may use others' work and avoid duplicate audit efforts. *In addition, audits performed in accordance with* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> This documentation requirement does not increase the auditors' responsibility for testing internal control but is intended to assist the auditor in ensuring that audit objectives are met and audit risk is reduced to an acceptable level.

GAGAS are subject to quality control and assurance reviews. Auditors should make

aArrangements should be made so that working papers to make audit documentation will be made

available, upon request, in a timely manner to other auditors or reviewers. To facilitate reviews of

audit quality and reliance by other auditors on the auditors' work, eContractual arrangements for

GAGAS audits should provide for full and timely access to working papers audit documentation to

facilitate reliance by other auditors on the auditors' work, as well as reviews of audit quality

control and assurance.

4.24 Audit organizations should establish reasonable policies and procedures for the safe custody and retention of audit documentation for a time sufficient to satisfy legal and administrative requirements. If audit documentation is only retained electronically, the audit organization should ensure that the electronic documentation is capable of being accessed throughout the specified retention period established for audit documentation and is safeguarded through sound computer security.

**ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS** 

FOR FINANCIAL AUDITS PERFORMED

**IN ACCORDANCE WITH GAGAS** 

4.25 As discussed in chapter 1, financial audits contribute to making governments more accountable for the use of public resources and the delivery of services. Because of the increased accountability associated with government audits, auditors performing financial audits in

accordance with GAGAS should consider the following guidance related to audit risk and materiality (see paragraphs 4.26 and 4.27), internal control over safeguarding of assets (see paragraphs 4.28 through 4.33), internal control over compliance (see paragraphs 4.34 through 4.36), and professional judgment concerning possible fraud and illegal acts (see paragraphs 4.37 and 4.39).

#### **PLANNING**

# **Audit Risk and Materiality**

**4.6** AICPA standards and GAGAS require the following:

The work is to be properly planned, and auditors should consider materiality, among other matters, in determining the nature, timing, and extent of auditing procedures and in evaluating the results of those procedures.

4.26 4.6.1 The AICPA standards and GAGAS require that the work is to be properly planned, and auditors should consider audit risk and materiality, among other matters, in determining the nature, timing, and extent of auditing procedures and in evaluating the results of those procedures. Auditors' consideration of audit risk and materiality is a matter of professional judgment and is influenced by their perception of the needs of a reasonable person who will rely on the financial statements. Materiality judgments are made in light of surrounding circumstances and necessarily involve both quantitative and qualitative considerations.

4.27 4.6.2 In an audit of the financial statements of a government entity or an entity that receives government assistance, auditors may *need to* set lower materiality levels than in audits in the private sector because of the public accountability of the auditee audited entity, the various legal and regulatory requirements, and the visibility and sensitivity of government programs, activities, and functions.

## INTERNAL CONTROL

**4.21** AICPA standards and GAGAS require the following:

Auditors should obtain a sufficient understanding of internal control to plan the audit and determine the nature, timing, and extent of tests to be performed.

**4.21.1** AICPA standards and GAGAS require that, in all audits, auditors obtain an understanding of internal control sufficient to plan the audit by performing procedures to understand (1) the design of controls relevant to an audit of financial statements and (2) whether the controls have been placed in operation. This understanding should include a consideration of the methods an entity uses to process accounting information because such methods influence the design of internal control. The extent to which computerized information systems are used in significant accounting applications, <sup>5.1</sup> as well as the complexity of that processing, may also influence the nature, timing, and extent of

<sup>5:1-</sup>Significant accounting applications are those which relate to accounting information that can materially affect the financial statements the auditor is auditing. Significant accounting applications could include financial as well as other systems, such as management information systems or systems that monitor compliance, if they provide data for material account balances, transaction classes, and disclosure components of financial statements.

audit procedures. Accordingly, in planning the audit and in obtaining an understanding of internal control over an entity's computer processing, auditors should consider, among other things, such matters as

a. the extent to which computer processing is used in each significant accounting application;<sup>5.2</sup>

**b.** the complexity of the entity's computer operations;

c. the organizational structure of the computer processing activities; and

d. the kinds and competence of available evidential matter, in electronic and in paper formats, to achieve audit objectives:

4.21.2 AICPA standards and GAGAS require auditors to document their understanding of the components of an entity's internal control related to computer applications that process information used in preparing an entity's financial statements and, based on that understanding, to develop a planned audit approach in sufficient detail to demonstrate its effectiveness in reducing audit risk. In doing so, under AICPA standards and GAGAS, auditors should consider whether specialized skills are needed for considering the effect of computerized information systems on the audit, understanding internal control, or designing and performing audit procedures, including tests of

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5-2</sup>-Obtaining an understanding of these elements would include consideration of internal control related to security over computerized information systems.

internal control. If the use of a professional with specialized skills is planned, the auditor should have sufficient computer-related knowledge to

a. communicate the objectives of the other professional's work;

b. to evaluate whether the specified procedures will meet the auditors' objectives; and

c. to evaluate the results of the procedures applied as they relate to the nature, timing, and extent of other planned audit procedures.

4.21.3 The additional internal control standard for financial statement is

In planning the audit, auditors should document in the working papers (1) the basis for assessing control risk at the maximum level for assertions related to material account balances, transaction classes, and disclosure components of financial statements when such assertions are significantly dependent upon computerized information systems and (2) consideration that the planned audit procedures are designed to achieve audit objectives and to reduce audit risk to an acceptable.

**4.21.4.** This additional GAGAS standard does not increase the auditor's 'responsibility for testing controls, but rather requires that, if the auditors assesses control risk at the maximum level for assertions related to material account balances, transaction classes, and disclosure components of financial statements when such assertions are significantly dependent upon computerized

information systems, the auditors should document in the working papers <sup>314</sup> the basis for that conclusion by addressing (1) the ineffectiveness of the design and/or operation of the controls, or (2) the reasons why it would be inefficient to test the controls. In such circumstances, GAGAS also require the auditors to document in the working papers the consideration that the planned audit procedures are designed to achieve specific audit objectives and, accordingly, to reduce audit risk to an acceptable level. This documentation should address

a. the rationale for determining the nature, timing, and extent of planned audit procedures;

b. the kinds and competence of available evidential matter produced outside a computerized information system; and

c. the effect on the audit opinion or report if evidential matter to be gathered during the audit does not afford a reasonable basis for the auditor's opinion on the financial statements.

# Internal Control Over

# Safeguarding of Assets

4.28 4.22 Safeguarding of assets and compliance with laws and regulations are is an internal control objectives that are is especially important in conducting performing financial statement audits in accordance with GAGAS of governmental entities or others receiving government funds. 11 Given

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup>\_5.3 See paragraphs 4.34 through 4.38 for a discussion of the working paper standards .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Auditors should apply the guidance contained in this section to other types of financial audits to the extent it is applicable to the nature of the engagement.

the public accountability for stewardship of resources, safeguarding of assets permeates control objectives and components as defined by the AICPA standards and GAGAS. Also, the operation of government programs and the related transactions that materially affect the entity's financial statements are generally governed by laws and regulations. Although GAGAS are not prescribing additional internal control standards in these areas, this chapter provides a discussion that auditors may find useful in assessing audit risk and in obtaining evidence needed to support their opinion on the financial statements in a governmental environment.

[Paragraphs 4.23 and 4.24 deleted.]

### Safeguarding of Assets

**4.29 4.25** As applied to financial statement audits, internal control over safeguarding of assets constitutes a process, effected by an entity's governing body, management, and other personnel designed to provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition of the entity's assets that could have a material effect on the financial statements.

4.30 4.26 Internal control over the safeguarding of assets relates to the prevention or timely detection of unauthorized transactions and unauthorized access to assets that could result in losses that are material to the financial statements, *such as* for example, when unauthorized expenditures or investments are made, unauthorized liabilities are incurred, inventory is stolen, or assets are converted to personal use. Such controls are designed to help ensure the use of and access to assets

are in accordance with management's authorization. Authorization includes approval of transactions in accordance with control activities established by management to safeguard assets, such as establishing and complying with requirements for extending and monitoring credit or making investment decisions, and related documentation. Control over safeguarding of assets is not designed to protect against loss of assets arising from inefficiency or from management's operating decisions, such as incurring expenditures for equipment or material that proves to be unnecessary or unsatisfactory.

4.31 4.27 AICPA standards and GAGAS require auditors to obtain a sufficient understanding of internal control to plan the audit. They also require auditors to plan the audit to provide reasonable assurance of detecting material fraud, including material misappropriation of assets. Because preventing or detecting material misappropriations is an objective of control over safeguarding of assets, understanding this type of control can be essential to planning the audit.

4.32 4.28 Control over safeguarding of assets is not limited to preventing or detecting misappropriations, however. It also helps prevent or detect other material losses that could result from unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition of assets. Such controls include, for example, the process of assessing the risk of unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition of assets and establishing control activities to help ensure that management directives to address the risk are carried out. Such control activities would include permitting acquisition, use, or disposition of assets only in accordance with management's general or specific authorization, including compliance with established control activities for such acquisition, use, or disposition. They would also include comparing existing assets with the related records at reasonable intervals and taking appropriate

action with respect to any differences. Finally, controls over safeguarding of assets against unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition also relate to making available to management information it needs to carry out its responsibilities related to prevention or timely detection of such unauthorized activities, as well as mechanisms to enable management to monitor the continued effective operation of such controls.

- 4.33 4.29 Understanding the control over safeguarding of assets can help auditors assess the risk that financial statements could be materially misstated. For example, an understanding of an auditee's the audited entity's control over the safeguarding of assets can help auditors recognize risk factors such as
- **a.** failure to adequately monitor decentralized operations;
- **b.** lack of control over activities, such as lack of documentation separation of duties or approval for major transactions;
- **c.** lack of control over computerized information systems, such as a lack of control over access to applications that initiate or control the movement of assets;
- **d.** failure to develop or communicate adequate control activities for security of data or assets, such as allowing unauthorized personnel to have ready access to data or assets; and

**f.** failure to investigate significant unreconciled differences between reconciliations of a control account and subsidiary records.

**Internal** Control Over Compliance

With Laws and Regulations

4.34 4.29.1 Governmental entities are subject to a variety of laws and regulations that affect their financial statements or other financial data, which is a major factor distinguishing governmental accounting from commercial private-sector accounting. For example, such laws and regulations may address the required fund structure, procurement or debt limitations, or authority for transactions. Accordingly, compliance with such laws and regulations may have a direct and material effect on the determination of amounts in the financial statements of governmental entities. Likewise, organizations entities that receive government assistance, such as contractors, nonprofit organizations entities, and other nongovernmental organizations entities, are also subject to regulations, contract provisions, or grant agreements that could have a direct and material effect on their financial statements. Management, of both governmental entities and others receiving governmental assistance, is responsible for ensuring that the entity complies with not only the laws and regulations but also contract provisions and grant agreements applicable to its activities. That responsibility encompasses the identification of applicable laws, and regulations, contract provisions, and grant agreements, and as well as the establishment of controls designed to provide reasonable assurance that the entity complies with those laws, and regulations, contract provisions, and grant agreements.

4.35 4.30 AICPA standards and GAGAS require auditors to design the audit to provide reasonable assurance that the financial statements are free of material misstatements resulting from violations of laws and regulations noncompliance that have a direct and material effect on the determination of

financial statement amounts. To meet that this requirement, auditors should have an understanding of internal control relevant to financial statement assertions affected by those laws, and regulations, contract provisions, or grant agreements. 4.15 Auditors should obtain an understanding of the possible effects on financial statements of laws and regulations that are generally recognized by auditors to have a direct and material effect on the determination of amounts in the financial statements. Auditors may find it necessary to use the work of legal counsel in (1) determining which laws and regulations might have a direct and material effect on the financial statements, (2) designing tests of compliance with laws and regulations, and (3) evaluating the results of those tests. Auditors also may find it necessary to use the work of legal counsel when an audit requires testing compliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements. Depending on the circumstances of the audit, auditors may find it necessary to obtain information on compliance matters from others, such as investigative staff, audit organizations, and officials of government entities that provided assistance to the auditee audited entity, and/or the applicable law enforcement authority.

4.36 AICPA standards and GAGAS require that aAuditors should use that their understanding of internal control relevant to financial statement assertions affected by laws and regulations to identify types of potential misstatements, consider factors that affect the risk of material misstatement, and design substantive tests. GAGAS extends this requirement to include contract provisions and grant agreements. In applying this requirement, For example, the following factors may influence the auditors' assessment of control risk:

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12 5</sup>AICPA standards provide guidance for auditors who use the work of a specialist who is not a member of their staff.

a.	management's awareness or lack of awareness of applicable laws, and regulations, contract	
provisions, or grant agreements;		

**b.** auditee policy of the audited entity regarding such matters as acceptable operating practices and codes of conduct; and

**c.** assignment of responsibility and delegation of authority to deal with such matters as organizational goals and objectives, operating functions, and regulatory requirements.

[Paragraphs 4.31 through 4.33 deleted.]

FRAUD, ILLEGAL ACTS, AND OTHER NONCOMPLIANCE

4.1219 AICPA standards and GAGAS require the following:

a. Auditors should design the audit to provide reasonable assurance of detecting fraud that is material to the financial statements.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>\*2</sup> Two types of misstatements are relevant to the auditors' consideration of fraud in a financial statement audit—misstatements arising from fraudulent financial statements and misstatements arising from misappropriation of assets. The primary factor that distinguishes fraud from error is whether the underlying action that results in the misstatement in the financial statements is intentional or unintentional.

**b.** Auditors should design the audit to provide reasonable assurance of detecting material

misstatements resulting from direct and material illegal acts.9

c. Auditors should be aware of the possibility that indirect illegal acts may have occurred. He are the control of the possibility that indirect illegal acts may have occurred.

specific information comes to the auditors' attention that provides evidence concerning the existence

of possible illegal acts that could have a material indirect effect on the financial statements, the

auditors should apply audit procedures specifically directed to ascertaining whether an illegal act has

occurred.

Due Care Concerning Possible Fraud and Illegal Acts

**Professional Judgment Concerning** 

Possible Fraud and Illegal Acts

Auditors' Understanding of Possible Fraud and of Laws and Regulations

4.37 4.14 Under AICPA standards and GAGAS, aAuditors are responsible for being aware of the

characteristics and types of potentially material fraud that could be associated with the area being

audited so that they can plan the audit to provide reasonable assurance of detecting *material* 

misstatements of the financial statements due to fraud.

<sup>9-3</sup>Direct and material illegal acts are violations of laws and regulations having a direct and material effect on the

determination of financial statement amounts.

<sup>10</sup>-<sup>4</sup>Indirect illegal acts are violations of laws and regulations having material but indirect effects on the financial

statements.

30

4.38 4.16 Auditors should exercise due professional care judgment in pursuing indications of possible fraud and illegal acts so as not to interfere with potential future investigations, legal proceedings, or both. Under some circumstances, laws, regulations, or policies may require auditors to report indications of certain types of fraud or illegal acts to law enforcement or investigatory authorities before extending audit steps and procedures. Auditors may also be required to withdraw from or defer further work on the audit or a portion of the audit in order not to interfere with an investigation.

**4.39 4.17** An audit made in accordance with GAGAS will not guarantee the discovery of *fraud or* illegal acts or contingent liabilities resulting from them. Nor does the subsequent discovery of illegal acts committed during the audit period necessarily mean that the auditors' performance was inadequate, provided the audit was made in accordance with these standards *GAGAS*.

### **FINANCIAL RELATED AUDITS**

**4.39** Certain AICPA standards address specific types of financial related audits, and GAGAS incorporate those standards, as discussed below: <sup>13</sup>

a. SAS No. 75, Engagements to Apply Agreed-Upon Procedures to Specific Elements, Accounts, or Items of a Financial Statement;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup>GAGAS incorporate any new AICPA field work standards relevant to financial related audits unless GAO excludes them by formal announcement.

**b.** SAS No. 62, *Special Reports*, for auditing specified elements, accounts, or items of a financial statement;

c. SAS No. 74, Compliance Auditing Considerations in Audits of Governmental Entities and Recipients of Governmental Financial Assistance, for testing compliance with laws and regulations applicable to federal financial assistance programs;

**d.** SAS No. 70, Reports on the Processing of Transactions by Service Organizations, for examining descriptions of internal control of service organizations that process transactions for others;

e. Statement on Standards for Attestation Engagements (SSAE) No. 1, Attestation Standards, as amended by SSAE No. 9, Amendments to Statement on Standards for Attestation Engagements

Nos. 1, 2, and 3, for examining or reviewing an entity's assertions about financial related matters not specifically addressed in other AICPA standards;

**f.** SSAE No. 2, Reporting on an Entity's Internal Control Over Financial Reporting, as amended by SSAE No. 9, Amendments to Statement on Standards for Attestation Engagements Nos. 1, 2, and 3, for examining an entity's assertions about its internal control over financial reporting and/or safeguarding assets;

g. SSAE No. 3, Compliance Attestation, as amended by SSAE No. 9, Amendments to Statement on Standards for Attestation Engagements Nos. 1, 2, and 3, for (1) examining or applying agreed-upon procedures to an entity's assertions about compliance with specified requirements or (2) applying

agreed-upon procedures to an entity's assertions about internal control over compliance with laws and regulations; and

h. SSAE No. 4, Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagements, for applying agreed-upon procedures to (1) an entity's assertions about internal control over financial reporting and/or safeguarding of assets or (2) an entity's assertions about financial related matters not specifically addressed in other AICPA standards.

4.40 Besides following applicable AICPA standards, auditors should follow this chapter's audit follow-up and working paper standards. They should apply or adapt the other standards and guidance in this chapter as appropriate in the circumstances. For financial related audits not described above, auditors should follow the field work standards for performance audits in chapter 6

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Chapter 2 provides examples of other types of financial related audits.

#### CHAPTER 5

### REPORTING STANDARDS FOR FINANCIAL AUDITS

# **PURPOSE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

5.1 This chapter prescribes presents reporting standards of reporting for financial audits, which include audits of financial statements audits and financial related audits and other work governed by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' (AICPA) generally accepted auditing standards and related Statements on Auditing Standards (SASs). Generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS) incorporate the AICPA field work and reporting standards and related SASs unless the Comptroller General of the United States excludes them by formal announcement. This chapter identifies the AICPA generally accepted reporting standards and prescribes for financial audits conducted in accordance with GAGAS additional reporting standards on

a. reporting compliance with generally accepted government auditing standards (see paragraphs 5.3 through 5.6),

1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> To date, the Comptroller General has not excluded any field work or reporting standards or statements on auditing standards.

- b. reporting on compliance with laws and regulations and on internal control over financial reporting (see paragraphs 5.7 through 5.10),
- c. reporting deficiencies in internal control (see paragraphs 5.11 through 5.15),
- d. reporting fraud, illegal acts, and other noncompliance (see paragraphs 5.16 through 5.26),
- e. reporting views of responsible officials (see paragraph 5.27 through 5.31),
- f. privileged and confidential information (see paragraphs 5.32 through 5.34), and
- g. report issuance and distribution. (See paragraphs 5.35 through 5.38.)

# RELATION TO AICPA REPORTING STANDARDS

- 5.2 For financial statement audits, generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS) incorporate the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants' (AICPA) *The* four *AICPA* generally accepted standards of reporting, which are: as follows.
- a. The report shall state whether the financial statements are presented in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

- b. The report shall identify those circumstances in which such principles have not been consistently observed in the current period in relation to the preceding period.
- c. Informative disclosures in the financial statements are to be regarded as reasonably adequate unless otherwise stated in the report.
- d. The report shall either contain an expression of opinion regarding the financial statements, taken as a whole, or an assertion to the effect that an opinion cannot be expressed. When an overall opinion cannot be expressed, the reasons therefor should be stated. In all cases where an auditor's name is associated with financial statements, the report should contain a clear-cut indication of the character of the auditor's work, if any, and the degree of responsibility the auditor is taking.
- **5.3** The AICPA has issued statements on auditing standards (SAS) that interpret its standards of reporting. <sup>†</sup> This chapter incorporates these SASs and prescribes additional standards on
- a. reporting compliance with GAGAS (see paragraphs 5.11 through 5.14),
- **b.** reporting on compliance with laws and regulations and on internal control over financial reporting (see paragraphs 5.15 through 5.28),

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>GAGAS incorporate any new AICPA reporting standards relevant to financial statement unless the General Accounting Office (GAO) excludes them by formal announcement.

**c.** privileged and confidential information (see paragraphs 5.29 through 5.31), and **d.** report distribution. (See paragraphs 5.32 through 5.35.)

5.4 This chapter concludes by explaining which standards auditors should follow in reporting the results of financial related audits.

[Paragraphs 5.5 through 5.10 and footnote 2 deleted.]

REPORTING COMPLIANCE WITH GENERALLY

ACCEPTED GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS

5.3 5.11 The first An additional reporting standard for financial statement audits conducted in accordance with GAGAS is:

Audit reports should state that the audit was made in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

5.4 5.12 The above statement refers to all the applicable standards that the auditors should have followed during their audit. The statement *referencing compliance with generally accepted government auditing standards* should be qualified in situations where the auditors did not follow an applicable standard. In these situations, the auditors should disclose *in the scope* 

section of the report the applicable standard that was not followed, the reasons therefor, and how not following the standard affected, or could have affected, the results of the audit.

5.5 5.13 When the report on the financial statements audit is submitted to comply with a legal, regulatory, or contractual requirement for a GAGAS audit, it should specifically cite GAGAS.The report on the financial statements audit may cite AICPA standards as well as GAGAS.

5.6 5.14 The auditee An audited entity receiving a GAGAS audit report may also need a financial statement audit report for purposes other than to comply with requirements calling for a GAGAS audit. For example, it the audited entity may need a audited financial statements audit to issue bonds or for other financing purposes. GAGAS do not prohibit auditors from issuing a separate report on the financial statements conforming only to the requirements of AICPA standards. However, it may be advantageous to use a report issued in accordance with GAGAS for these other purposes because it provides information on compliance with laws and regulations and internal control (as discussed below) that is not contained in a report issued in accordance with AICPA standards. When a GAGAS audit is the basis for an auditor's subsequent report under the AICPA standards, it would be advantageous to users of the subsequent report for the auditor's report to include the information on compliance with laws and regulations and internal control that is required by GAGAS but not required by AICPA standards. To reissue essentially the same report omitting information regarding compliance with laws and regulations and internal control is not in the public interest.

REPORTING ON COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND REGULATIONS AND ON INTERNAL CONTROL

**OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING** 

5.7 5.15 The second An additional reporting standard for financial statement audits conducted in accordance with GAGAS is:

When providing an opinion on financial statements, auditors should include in The their report on the financial statements should either a (1) describe description of the scope of the auditors' testing of compliance with laws and regulations and internal control over financial reporting and present the results of those tests or an opinion, if sufficient work was performed; or (2) reference to the separate report(s) containing that information. In presenting the results of those tests, auditors should report fraud, illegal acts, other material noncompliance, and reportable conditions in internal control over financial reporting. In some circumstances, auditors should report fraud and illegal acts directly to parties external to the audited entity.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Although the following standard on reporting on compliance with laws and regulations and on internal control over financial reporting is applicable to audits of financial statements, the requirement to report deficiencies in internal control (see paragraphs 5.11 through 5.15) and reporting fraud, illegal acts, and other noncompliance (see paragraphs 5.16 through 5.26) is applicable to all financial audits.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>-These responsibilities are in addition to and do not modify auditors' responsibilities under AICPA standards to (1) address the effect fraud or illegal acts may have on the report on the financial statements and (2) determine that the audit committee or others with equivalent authority and responsibility are adequately informed about fraud, illegal acts, and reportable conditions.

5.8 5.16 Auditors may report on compliance with laws and regulations and internal control over financial reporting in the report on the financial statements or in separate report(s). When auditors report on compliance and internal control over financial reporting in as part of the report on the financial statements, they auditors should include an introduction summarizing key findings in the audit of the financial statements and the related compliance and internal control work. Auditors should not issue this introduction as a stand-alone report.

5.9 5.16.1 When auditors report separately (including separate reports bound in the same document) on compliance with laws and regulations and internal control over financial reporting, the report on the financial statements should state that they the auditors are issuing those additional reports. The report on the financial statements should also state that the reports on compliance with laws and regulations and internal control over financial reporting are an integral part of a GAGAS audit, and, in considering the results of the audit, these reports should be read along with the auditors' report on the financial statements.

# Scope of Compliance and Internal Control Work

5.10 5.17 Auditors should report the scope of their testing of compliance with laws and regulations and of internal control over financial reporting, including whether or not the tests they performed provided sufficient evidence to support an opinion on compliance with laws and

*regulations* or internal control over financial reporting and whether the auditors are providing such opinions.<sup>3</sup>

Deficiencies in Internal Control

### **REPORTING DEFICIENCIES IN**

### **INTERNAL CONTROL**

5.11 5.26 The additional reporting standard for financial audits conducted in accordance with GAGAS is:

Auditors should report significant deficiencies in internal control considered to be reportable conditions as defined in AICPA standards.

5.12 Auditors should report deficiencies in internal control that they consider to be "reportable conditions" as defined in AICPA standards. The following are examples of matters that may be reportable conditions:<sup>4</sup>

a. absence of appropriate segregation of duties consistent with appropriate control objectives;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Auditors should follow the AICPA's Standards for Attestation Engagements when providing opinions on internal control over compliance with laws and regulations or on internal control over financial reporting. See chapter 6 for a discussion of the attestation standards.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> AICPA standards define reportable conditions as significant deficiencies in the design or operation of internal control which could adversely affect the entity's ability to record, process, summarize, and report financial data consistent with the assertions of management in the financial statements.

<b>b.</b> absence of appropriate reviews and approvals of transactions, accounting entries, or systems output;
c. inadequate provisions for the safeguarding of assets;
<b>d.</b> evidence of failure to safeguard assets from loss, damage, or misappropriation;
e. evidence that a system fails to provide complete and accurate output consistent with the auditee's control objectives of the audited entity because of the misapplication of control procedures activities;
<b>f.</b> evidence of intentional override of internal control by those in authority to the detriment of the overall objectives of the system;
<b>g.</b> evidence of failure to perform tasks that are part of internal control, such as reconciliations not prepared or not timely prepared;
<b>h.</b> absence of a sufficient level of control consciousness within the organization;
<ul> <li>i. significant deficiencies in the design or operation of internal control that could result in violations of laws and regulations having a direct and material effect on the financial statements;</li> <li>and</li> </ul>

j. failure to follow up and correct previously identified deficiencies in internal control.8

5.13 5.27 In reporting on deficiencies in internal control reportable conditions, auditors should identify those that are individually or cumulatively in the aggregate considered to be material weaknesses. Auditors should place their findings in proper perspective by providing a description of the objectives, scope, and methodology used to conduct the work. To give the reader a basis for judging the prevalence and consequences of these findings, the instances identified should be related to the population or the number of cases examined and be quantified in terms of dollar value, if appropriate. Auditors may include such information in their audit report or may prepare a separate report. If auditors report separately, the audit report should contain a reference to the separate report containing this information and state that the separate report is an integral part of the audit and should be considered in assessing the results of the audit. Auditors should follow chapter 7's report contents standards for

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>Chapter 4's audit follow-up standard requires auditors to report the status of uncorrected material findings, and recommendations from prior audits that affect the financial statement audit.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See footnote 5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The AICPA standards define a material weakness as a reportable condition in which the design or operation of one or more of the internal control components does not reduce to a relatively low level the risk that misstatements caused by error or fraud in amounts that would be material in relation to the financial statements being audited may occur and not be detected within a timely period by employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> For audits of financial statements, such information is generally included in the reports on compliance and internal control over financial reporting.

objectives, scope, and methodology; audit results; views of responsible officials; and its report presentation standards, as appropriate.

- 5.14 To the extent possible, auditors should present findings to identify the elements of criteria, condition, and effect, as well as cause when problems are found. In addition, auditors should provide recommendations for corrective action if auditors are able to sufficiently develop the findings. However, the elements needed for a finding depend entirely on the scope and objectives of the financial audit, and, as a result, may not always have all of the elements fully developed. At a minimum, auditors should identify the condition, criteria, and possible effect to provide sufficient information to federal, state, and local officials to assist them in taking corrective action.
- 5.15 5.28 When auditors detect deficiencies in internal control that are not reportable conditions, they should communicate those deficiencies to the auditee officials of the audited entity, preferably in writing. If the auditors have communicated other deficiencies in internal control in a management letter to top management officials of the audited entity, they auditors should refer to that management letter when they report on internal control. Auditors should include in their audit documentation evidence of Aall communications to the auditee officials of the audited entity about deficiencies in internal control should be documented in the working papers.

Fraud, Illegal Acts, and

Other Noncompliance

REPORTING FRAUD, ILLEGAL ACTS,

AND OTHER NONCOMPLIANCE

5.16 An additional reporting standard for financial audits conducted in accordance with

GAGAS is:

Auditors should report fraud, illegal acts, or other material noncompliance. In some circumstances, auditors should report fraud and illegal acts directly to parties external to the

audited entity.

5.17 AICPA standards and GAGAS require auditors to address the effect fraud or illegal acts

may have on the audit report and to determine that the audit committee or others with

equivalent authority and responsibility are adequately informed about the fraud or illegal acts.

The additional GAGAS standard does not modify these responsibilities. However, AICPA

standards do not require that this communication be written, nor do they address

communication regarding other noncompliance (violations of other compliance requirements

such as provisions of contracts or grant agreements).

12

5.18 When auditors conclude, based on *the basis of* evidence obtained, that fraud or an illegal act either has occurred or is likely to have occurred, <sup>47</sup> they should report *the* relevant information. Auditors need not report information about fraud or an illegal act that is clearly inconsequential. Thus, auditors should *include* present in a *their* report the same *information* about fraud and illegal acts that they report to have informed the audit committees about under AICPA standards. Auditors should also report other noncompliance (for example, a violation of a contract provision) that is material to the financial statements audit.

5.19 In reporting material fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance, the auditors should place their findings in proper perspective by providing a description of the objectives, scope, and methodology used to conduct the work. To give the reader a basis for judging the prevalence and consequences of these conditions findings, the instances identified should be related to the universe population or the number of cases examined and be quantified in terms of dollar value, if appropriate. Auditors may include such information in their audit report or may prepare a separate report. If auditors report separately, the audit report should contain a reference to the separate report containing this information and state that the report is an integral part of the audit and should be considered in assessing the results of the audit. In presenting material

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>74</sup>Whether a particular act is, in fact, illegal may have to await final determination by a court of law *or other adjudicative body*. Thus, when auditors disclose matters that have led them to conclude that an illegal act is likely to have occurred, they should take care not to imply that they have made a determination of illegality.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Audit findings have often been regarded as containing the elements of criteria, condition, and effect, plus cause when problems are found. However, the elements needed for a finding depend entirely on the objectives of the audit. Reportable conditions and noncompliance found by the auditor may not always have all of these elements fully developed, given the scope and objectives of the specific financial audit. However, auditors should identify at least the condition, criteria, and possible asserted effect to provide sufficient information to federal, state, and local officials to permit them to determine the effect and cause in order to take prompt and proper corrective action.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> For audits of financial statements, such information is generally included in the reports on compliance with laws and regulations and internal control over financial reporting.

fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance, auditors should follow chapter 7's report contents standards for objectives, scope, and methodology; audit results; views of responsible officials; and its report presentation standards, as appropriate. Auditors may provide less extensive disclosure of fraud and illegal acts that are not material in either a quantitative or qualitative sense.

5.20 To the extent possible, auditors should present findings to identify the elements of criteria, condition, and effect, as well as cause when problems are found. In addition, auditors should provide recommendations for corrective action if auditors are able to sufficiently develop the findings. However, the elements needed for a finding depend entirely on the scope and objectives of the financial audit, and, as a result, may not always have all of the elements fully developed. At a minimum, auditors should identify the condition, criteria, and possible effect to provide sufficient information to federal, state, and local officials to assist them in taking corrective action. Auditors should also obtain the views of responsible officials of the audited entity regarding the findings and include this information in the report as appropriate.

5.21 5.20 When auditors detect fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance that do not meet criteria for reporting in paragraph 5.18's criteria for reporting, they should communicate those findings to the auditee officials of the audited entity, preferably in writing. If auditors have communicated those findings in a management letter to top management officials of the audited entity, they auditors should refer to that management letter when they report on compliance.

Auditors may provide less extensive disclosure of fraud and illegal acts that are not material in

either a quantitative or qualitative sense. Auditors should document in their working papers include in their audit documentation evidence of all communications to the auditee officials of the audited entity about fraud, illegal acts, and other noncompliance.

Direct Reporting of Fraud and Illegal Acts

5.22 5.21 GAGAS require auditors to report fraud or illegal acts directly to parties outside the auditee the audited entity in two circumstances, as discussed below. These requirements are in addition to any legal requirements for direct reporting of fraud or illegal acts. Auditors should meet these requirements even if they have resigned or been dismissed from the audit. 710

5.23 5.22 The auditee Officials of the audited entity may be required by law or regulation to report certain fraud or illegal acts to specified external parties, such as (for example, to a federal inspector general or a state attorney general). If auditors have communicated such fraud or illegal acts to the auditee officials of the audited entity and it they fails to report them, then the auditors should communicate their such an awareness of that failure to the auditee's governing body of the audited entity. If the auditee officials of the audited entity does not make the required report as soon as practicable after the auditors' communication with it's the entity's

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Paragraphs 4.6 and 4.7 provide guidance on factors that may influence auditors' materiality judgments in audits of government entities or entities receiving government assistance. AICPA standards provide guidance on the interaction of quantitative and qualitative considerations in materiality judgments.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10 7</sup>Internal auditors auditing within the entity that employs them *organizations* do not have a duty to report outside that entity *unless required by law, rule, regulation, or policy*.

governing body, then the auditors should report the fraud or illegal acts directly to the external party specified in the law or regulation.

5.24 5.23 Management of the audited entity is responsible for taking timely and appropriate steps to remedy fraud or illegal acts that auditors report to it. When fraud or an illegal act involves assistance received directly or indirectly from a government agency, auditors may have a duty to report it directly if management fails to take remedial steps. If auditors conclude that such

failure is likely to cause them to depart from the standard report on the financial statements or resign from the audit, then they should communicate that conclusion to the auditee's governing body of the audited entity. Then, if the auditee does officials of the audited entity do not report the fraud or illegal act as soon as practicable to the entity that provided the government assistance, the auditors should report the fraud or illegal act directly to that entity.

5.25 5.24 In both of these situations, auditors should obtain sufficient, competent, and relevant evidence, *such as* (for example, by confirmation with outside parties,) to corroborate assertions by management that it has reported fraud or illegal acts. If they are unable to do so, then the auditors should report the fraud or illegal acts directly as discussed above.

5.26 5.25 Chapter 4 reminds auditors that *U*under some circumstances, laws, regulations, or policies may require them *auditors* to report promptly indications of certain types of fraud or illegal acts to law enforcement or investigatory authorities. When auditors conclude that this type of fraud or illegal act either has occurred or is likely to have occurred, they should ask those

authorities and/or legal counsel if reporting certain information about that fraud or illegal act would compromise investigative or legal proceedings. Auditors should limit their reporting to matters that would not compromise those proceedings, such as information that is already a part of the public record.

[Paragraphs 5.26 through 5.28 are moved to paragraphs 5.11 through 5.15.]

### **VIEWS OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS**

5.27 An additional reporting standard for financial audits performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

If the auditors' report discloses significant deficiencies, auditors should report the views of responsible officials concerning the findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as corrections planned.

5.28 One of the most effective ways to ensure that a report is fair, complete, and objective is to obtain advance review and comments by responsible officials of the audited entity and others, as may be appropriate. Including the views of responsible officials produces a report that shows not only what was found and what the auditors think about it but also what the responsible persons think about it and what they plan to do about it.

- 5.29 Auditors should normally request that the responsible officials' views on significant findings, conclusions, and recommendations be submitted in writing. Oral comments are acceptable as well, and, in some cases, may be the only or most expeditious way to obtain comments. Cases in which obtaining oral comments can be effective include when there is a time-critical need to meet a user's needs; the auditor has worked closely with the responsible officials throughout the conduct of the work and the parties are very familiar with the findings and issues addressed in the draft product; or the auditor does not expect major disagreements with the draft report's findings, conclusions, and recommendations, or perceive any major controversies with regard to the issued discussed in the draft report. Auditors should prepare a summary of the officials' oral comments and provide a copy of the summary to management of the audited entity to verify that the comments are accurately stated.
- 5.30 Comments should be fairly and objectively evaluated and recognized, as appropriate, in the final report. Comments, such as a promise or plan for corrective action, should be noted but should not be accepted as justification for dropping a significant finding or a related recommendation.
- 5.31 When the comments oppose the report's findings, conclusions, or recommendations, and are not, in the auditors' opinion, valid, the auditors should state their reasons for disagreeing with the comments. The auditors' disagreement should be stated in a fair and objective manner. Conversely, the auditors should modify their report as necessary if they find the comments valid. Auditors may wish to attach the comment letter to the audit report to provide the reader with both points of view.

#### PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

5.32 5.29 The third An additional reporting standard for financial statement audits conducted in accordance with GAGAS is:

If certain *pertinent* information is prohibited from general disclosure, the audit report should state the nature of the information omitted and the requirement that makes the omission necessary.

5.33 5.30 Certain information may be prohibited from general disclosure by federal, state, or local laws or regulations. Such information may be provided on a need-to-know basis in a separate limited official-use report which is restricted to only to persons authorized by law or regulation to receive it. The auditors should, when appropriate, consult with legal counsel regarding any requirements or other circumstances that may necessitate the omission of certain information.

5.34 Additional circumstances associated with public safety and security concerns could also justify the exclusion of certain information in the report. For example, information related to computer security for a particular program should be excluded from publicly available reports because of the potential damage that could be caused by the misuse of this information. In such circumstances, auditors may issue a limited official-use report containing such

information and distribute the report only to those parties responsible for acting on the auditors' recommendations. If auditors make the judgment that certain additional information should be excluded from a publicly available report, they should state the nature of the information omitted and the reasons that makes the omission necessary.

**5.31** If such requirements prohibit auditors from including pertinent data in the report, they should state the nature of the information omitted and the requirement that makes the omission necessary. The auditors should obtain assurance that a valid requirement for the omission exists and, when appropriate, consult with legal counsel.

### REPORT ISSUANCE AND DISTRIBUTION

5.35 5.32 The fourth An additional reporting standard for financial statement audits conducted in accordance with GAGAS is:

Auditors should submit wWritten audit reports are to be submitted by the audit organization to the appropriate officials of the auditee audited entity and to the appropriate officials of the organizations requiring or arranging for the audits, including external funding organizations such as legislative bodies, unless legal restrictions prevent it.

Auditors should also send cCopies of the reports should also be sent to other officials who have legal oversight authority or who may be responsible for acting on audit findings and recommendations and to others authorized to receive such reports. Unless the report is

restricted by law or regulation, or contains privileged and confidential information, auditors should ensure that copies should be made available for public inspection. 4011

5.36 5.33 Audit reports should be distributed in a timely manner to officials interested in the results. Such officials include those designated by law or regulation to receive such reports, those responsible for acting on the findings and recommendations, those of other levels of government that have provided assistance to the auditee audited entity, and legislators.
However, if the subject of the audit involves material that is classified for security purposes or not releasable to particular parties or the public for other valid reasons, auditors may limit the report distribution.

**5.37 5.34** When public accountants are engaged, the engaging organization should ensure that the report is distributed appropriately. If the public accountants are to make the distribution, the engagement agreement should indicate what which officials or organizations should receive the report.

5.38 5.35 Internal auditors should follow their entity's own arrangements and statutory requirements for distribution. Usually, they report to their entity's top managers, who are responsible for distribution of the report. Further distribution of reports outside the organization should be made in accordance with applicable laws, rules, regulations, or policy.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> <sup>+0</sup>See the Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133 *on single audits* for the distribution of reports on single audits of state and local governmental entities and nonprofit organizations that receive federal awards.

#### FINANCIAL RELATED AUDITS

**5.36** Certain AICPA standards address specific types of financial related audits, and GAGAS incorporate those standards, as discussed below:<sup>7</sup>

a. SAS No. 75, Engagements to Apply Agreed-Upon Procedures to Specific Elements, Accounts, or Items of a Financial Statement;

**b.** SAS No. 62, *Special Reports*, for auditing specified elements, accounts, or items of a financial statement;

c. SAS No. 74, Compliance Auditing Considerations in Audits of Governmental Entities and Recipients of Governmental Financial Assistance, for testing compliance with laws and regulations applicable to federal financial assistance programs;

**d.** SAS No. 70, Reports on the Processing of Transactions by Service Organizations, for examining descriptions of internal control of service organizations that process transactions for others;

e. Statement on Standards for Attestation Engagements (SSAE) No. 1, Attestation Standards, as amended by SSAE No. 9, Amendments to Statement on Standards for Attestation Engagements

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>GAGAS incorporate any new AICPA reporting standards relevant to financial related audits unless GAO excludes them by formal announcement.

Nos. 1, 2, and 3, for examining or reviewing an entity's assertions about financial related matters not specifically addressed in other AICPA standards;

**f.** SSAE No. 2, Reporting on an Entity's Internal Control Over Financial Reporting, as amended by SSAE No. 9, Amendments to Statement on Standards for Attestation Engagements Nos. 1, 2, and 3, for examining an entity's assertions about its internal control over financial reporting and/or safeguarding assets;

g. SSAE No. 3, Compliance Attestation, as amended by SSAE No. 9, Amendments to Statement on Standards for Attestation Engagements Nos. 1, 2, and 3, for (1) examining or applying agreed-upon procedures to an entity's assertions about compliance with specified requirements or (2) applying agreed-upon procedures to an entity's assertions about internal control over compliance with laws and regulations; and

h. SSAE No. 4, Agreed-Upon Procedures Engagements, for applying agreed-upon procedures to (1) an entity's assertions about internal control over financial reporting and/or safeguarding of assets or (2) an entity's assertions about financial related matters not specifically addressed in other AICPA standards.

**5.37** Besides following applicable AICPA standards, auditors should follow this chapter's first (GAGAS reference), third (privileged and confidential information), and fourth (report distribution) additional standards of reporting. They should apply or adapt the other standards

and guidance in this chapter as appropriate in the circumstances. For financial related audits not described above, auditors should follow the reporting standards for performance audits in chapter 7.8

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>Chapter 2 provides examples of other types of financial related audits.

## CHAPTER 6

# GENERAL, FIELD WORK, AND REPORTING STANDARDS FOR ATTESTATION ENGAGEMENTS

#### **INTRODUCTION**

6.1 In an attestation engagement, auditors issue an examination, a review, or an agreed-upon procedures report on subject matter, or on an assertion about the subject matter, that is the responsibility of another party. Attestation engagements can cover a broad range of financial or nonfinancial objectives<sup>1</sup> and can be part of a financial statement audit or other engagement. Attestation engagements are governed by the standards for attestation engagements issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA). Generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS) incorporate for attestation engagements the AICPA's general standard on criteria, its field work standards, and its reporting standards, as well as the AICPA Statements on Standards for Attestation Engagements (SSAEs), which interpret the attestation standards, unless the Comptroller General Accounting of the United States excludes them by formal announcement.<sup>2</sup> This

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See chapter 2 for examples of objectives for attestation engagements.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> To date, the Comptroller General has not excluded any field work standards, reporting standards, or statements on standards for attestation engagements.

chapter identifies the AICPA's general standard on criteria, <sup>3</sup> field work standards and reporting standards and prescribes additional field work and reporting standards, as well as guidance, for attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS.

# AICPA GENERAL AND FIELD WORK STANDARDS FOR ATTESTATION ENGAGEMENTS

6.2 The AICPA's general standard related to criteria states the following.

The practitioner [auditor] shall perform an engagement only if he or she has reason to believe that the subject matter is capable of evaluation against criteria that are suitable and available to users.

- 6.3 The two AICPA field work standards for attestation engagements are as follows.
- a. The work shall be adequately planned and assistants, if any, shall be properly supervised.

2

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> GAGAS incorporate only one of the AICPA's general standards for attestation engagements. In addition to this general standard, auditors should follow the general standards for work performed under GAGAS, as discussed in chapter 3.

b. Sufficient evidence shall be obtained to provide a reasonable basis for the conclusion that
is expressed in the report.
ADDITIONAL FIELD WORK STANDARDS
FOR ATTESTATION ENGAGEMENTS
6.4 GAGAS require additional field work standards for attestation engagements in the
following areas:
a. auditor communication (see paragraphs 6.5 and 6.7),
b considering the results of previous audits and attestation engagements (see paragraphs 6.8
through 6.10),
c. audit documentation (see paragraphs 6.11 through 6.17),
d. internal control (see paragraphs 6.18 and 6.19), and
e. fraud, illegal acts, and other noncompliance (see paragraphs 6.20 through 6.22).

#### Auditor Communication

6.5 An additional field work standard for attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

Auditors should communicate information to officials of the audited entity and the individual contracting for the audit services regarding the nature and extent of planned testing and reporting on the subject matter or assertion.

- 6.6 During the planning stages of an attestation engagement, auditors should communicate to officials of the audited entity and to individuals requesting or contracting for the services information regarding the nature and extent of testing and reporting, including any potential restriction of reports associated with the different levels of assurance services, to reduce the risk that the needs or expectations of the parties involved may be misinterpreted. For example, attestation standards provide for the following three levels of assurance.
- a. <u>Examination</u>: Auditors perform sufficient testing to express an opinion whether the subject matter is based on (or in conformity with) the criteria in all material respects or the assertion is presented (or fairly stated), in all material respects, based on the criteria.
- b. <u>Review</u>: Auditors perform sufficient testing to express a conclusion whether any information came to the auditors' attention on the basis of the work performed that indicates

the subject matter is not based on (or in conformity with) the criteria or the assertion is not presented (or fairly stated) in all material respects based on the criteria.<sup>4</sup>

c. <u>Agreed-Upon Procedures</u>: Auditors perform sufficient testing to issue a report of findings based on specific procedures performed on subject matter.

6.7 Auditors should use their professional judgment to determine the form and content of the communication, although written communication is preferred. Auditors may use an engagement letter, if appropriate, to communicate the information. If the attestation engagement is part of a larger audit, this information may be communicated as part of that audit. Whatever the form of the communication, auditors should include audit documentation regarding the communication.

# Considering the Results of Previous Audits

# and Attestation Engagements

6.8 An additional field work standard for attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

Auditors should consider the results of previous audits and attestation engagements and follow up on known significant findings and recommendations that directly relate to the subject matter of the attestation engagement being undertaken.

<sup>4</sup> As stated in the AICPA's statements on standards for attestation engagements, auditors should not perform review-level work for reporting on internal control or compliance with laws and regulations.

6.9 Auditors should determine whether officials of the audited entity have taken appropriate corrective actions on known reported significant findings and recommendations. In addition to following up on significant reported findings and recommendations from previous financial audits or attestation engagements, auditors should consider significant findings identified in performance audits and other studies if these findings relate to subject matter or assertions of the attestation engagement. For example, an audit report on an entity's computerized information systems may contain significant findings that could relate to the attestation engagement if the entity uses such systems to process information about the subject matter or contained in an assertion about the subject matter. Following up on known significant findings and recommendations identified in previous audits, attestation engagements, or studies can help auditors evaluate the subject matter or the assertion associated with the attestation engagement.

6.10 Providing continuing attention to significant findings and recommendations is important to ensure the benefits of audit work are realized. Ultimately, the benefits of audit work occur when audit findings are resolved through meaningful and effective corrective action in response to the auditors' findings and recommendations. Officials of the audited organization are responsible for resolving audit findings and recommendations directed to them and for having a process to track their status. If officials of the audited organization do not have such a process, auditors may wish to establish their own process.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Significant findings and recommendations are those matters that, if not corrected, could affect the results of the auditors' work and users' conclusions about those results.

#### **Audit Documentation**

6.11 The additional field work standard related to audit documentation for attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

Audit documentation should contain sufficient information to enable an experienced reviewer, who has had no previous connection with the attestation engagement, to ascertain from the audit documentation the evidence that supports the auditors' significant judgments and conclusions. Audit documentation that supports significant findings, conclusions, and recommendations should be complete before auditors issue their report.

6.12 AICPA standards and GAGAS require that auditors should prepare and maintain audit documentation. The form and content of audit documentation should be designed to meet the circumstances of the particular attestation engagement. The information contained in audit documentation constitutes the principal record of the work that the auditors have performed and the conclusions that the auditors have reached. The quantity, type, and content of audit documentation is a matter of the auditors' professional judgment.

6.13 GAGAS extend the level of required audit documentation to be sufficient for an experienced reviewer who has had no previous connection with the engagement to understand the evidence that supports the auditors' significant judgments and conclusions. Further, such documentation must be complete before auditors issue their report.

6.14 Attestation engagements done in accordance with GAGAS are subject to review by other auditors and by oversight officials more frequently than audits done in accordance with AICPA standards. Thus, whereas AICPA standards cite two main purposes of audit documentation--providing the principal support for the audit report and aiding auditors in the conduct and supervision of the audit--audit documentation serves an additional purpose in attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS. Audit documentation allows for the review of audit quality by providing the reviewer documentation, either in written or electronic formats, of the evidence supporting the auditors' significant judgments and conclusions.

6.15 Audit organizations should establish reasonable policies and procedures for the safe custody and retention of audit documentation for a time sufficient to satisfy legal and administrative requirements. If audit documentation is only retained electronically, the audit organization should ensure that the electronic documentation is capable of being accessed throughout the specified retention period established for audit documentation and is safeguarded through sound computer security.

6.16 Audit documentation for attestation engagements under GAGAS should contain the following.

a. the objectives, scope, and methodology, including any sampling criteria used;

b. documentation of the auditor's determination that certain additional government auditing standards do not apply or that an applicable standard was not followed, the reasons therefor, and the known effect that not following the standard had, or could have, on the attestation engagement;

c. documentation of the work performed to support significant judgments and conclusions, including descriptions of transactions and records examined that would enable an experienced reviewer to examine the same transactions and records;<sup>6</sup>

d. the consideration that the planned procedures are designed to achieve objectives of the attestation engagement when evidential matter obtained is highly dependent on computerized information systems and is material to the objective of the engagement, and the auditors are not relying on the effectiveness of internal control over those computerized systems that produced the information. The audit documentation should specifically address (1) the rationale for determining the nature, timing, and extent of planned audit procedures; (2) the kinds and competence of available evidential matter produced outside a computerized information system; and (3) the effect on the attestation engagement report if evidential matter to be gathered does not afford a reasonable basis to achieve the objectives of the engagement; and

e. evidence of supervisory reviews of the work performed.

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Auditors may meet this requirement by listing voucher numbers, check numbers, or other means of identifying specific documents they examined. Auditors are not required to include copies of documents they examined as part of the audit documentation, nor are auditors required to list detailed information from those documents.

6.17 One factor underlying GAGAS audits is that federal, state, and local governments and other organizations cooperate in auditing programs of common interest so that auditors may use others' work and avoid duplicate audit efforts. In addition, attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS are subject to quality control and assurance reviews. Auditors should make arrangements to make audit documentation available, upon request, in a timely manner to other auditors or reviewers. Contractual arrangements for attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS should provide for full and timely access to audit documentation to facilitate reliance by other auditors on the auditors' work, as well as reviews of audit quality control and assurance.

### **Internal Control**

6.18 An additional field work standard for attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

In planning examination-level attestation engagements, auditors should obtain a sufficient understanding of internal control that is material to the subject matter or assertion to plan the engagement and design procedures to achieve the objectives of the attestation engagement.

6.19 In planning the engagement, auditors should obtain an understanding of internal control<sup>7</sup> as it relates to the subject matter or assertion to which the auditors are attesting. The subject matter or assertion may be of a financial or nonfinancial nature, and internal control relevant to the subject matter or assertion the auditor is testing may relate to

a. effectiveness and efficiency of operations, including the use of an entity's resources;

b. reliability of financial reporting, including reports on budget execution and other reports for internal and external use;

c. compliance with applicable laws and regulations; and

d. safeguarding of assets.

#### Fraud, Illegal Acts, and Other Noncompliance

6.20 An additional field work standard for attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Although not applicable to attestation engagements, the AICPA statements on auditing standards may provide useful guidance related to internal control for auditors performing attestation engagements in accordance with GAGAS. In addition, auditors performing attestation engagements may wish to refer to the internal control guidance published by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO). The Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government (GAO/AIMD-00-21.3.1, November 1999), which incorporates the relevant guidance developed by COSO, provides definitions and fundamental concepts pertaining to internal control at the federal level and may be useful to auditors at any level of government. The related Internal Control Management and Evaluation Tool (GAO-01-1008G, August 2001), based on the federal internal control standards, provides a systematic, organized, and structured approach to assessing the internal control structure.

In planning examination-level attestation engagements, auditors should design the engagement to provide reasonable assurance of detecting fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance that could have a material effect on the subject matter or assertion of the attestation engagement.

6.21 Auditors should exercise professional judgment in planning the engagement by obtaining an understanding of the possible effects of fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance on the subject matter or assertion of the attestation engagement and by identifying and assessing any associated risks that could have a material effect on the attestation engagement. Auditors should include audit documentation on their assessment of risk, and, when risk factors are identified as being present, the documentation should include

- a. those risk factors identified, and
- b. the auditors' response to those risk factors, individually or in combination.
- 6.22 In addition, if during the performance of the attestation engagement, risk factors or other conditions are identified that cause the auditors to believe that an additional response is required, such factors or other conditions, and any future response the auditors concluded was appropriate, should be documented.

<sup>8</sup> Although not applicable to attestation engagements, the AICPA statements on auditing standards may provide useful guidance related to fraud for auditors performing attestation engagements in accordance with GAGAS.

12

#### AICPA REPORTING STANDARDS

## **FOR ATTESTATION ENGAGEMENTS**

- 6.23 The AICPA standards for attestation engagements provide for three levels of reporting based on the type of assurance the auditor is providing. (See paragraph 6.6.) The four AICPA reporting standards for attestation engagements are as follow.
- a. The report shall identify the subject matter or the assertion being reported on and state the character of the engagement.
- b. The report shall state the practitioner's [auditors'] conclusions about the subject matter or the assertion in relation to the criteria against which the subject matter was evaluated.
- c. The report shall state all of the practitioner's [auditors'] significant reservations about the engagement, the subject matter, and, if applicable, the assertion related thereto.
- d. The report shall state that the use of the report is restricted to specified parties under the following circumstances: (1) When the criteria used to evaluate the subject matter are determined by the practitioner to be appropriate only for a limited number of parties who either participated in their establishment or can be presumed to have an adequate understanding of the criteria. (2) When the criteria used to evaluate the subject matter are available only to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Auditors should, however, follow the report distribution standard. (See paragraphs 6.39 through 6.43.)

specified parties. (3) When reporting on subject matter and a written assertion has not been provided by the responsible party. (4) When the report is on an attest engagement to apply agreed-upon procedures to the subject matter.

# <u>ADDITIONAL REPORTING STANDARDS FOR</u> <u>ATTESTATION ENGAGEMENTS</u>

- 6.24 GAGAS require additional reporting standards for attestation engagements in the following areas:
- a. reporting compliance with generally accepted government auditing standards (see paragraphs 6.25 through 6.27),
- b. reporting on internal control and on fraud, illegal acts, and other noncompliance (see paragraphs 6.28 through 6.31),
- c. views of responsible officials (see paragraphs 6.32 through 6.36),
- d. privileged and confidential information (see paragraphs 6.37 and 6.38), and
- e. report issuance and distribution (see paragraphs 6.39 through 6.43).

#### Reporting Compliance With Generally Accepted

#### **Government Auditing Standards**

6.25 An additional reporting standard for attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

Reports on attestation engagements should state that the engagement was made in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

6.26 The above statement refers to all the applicable standards that the auditors should have followed during the attestation engagement. The statement should be qualified in situations where the auditors did not follow an applicable standard. In these situations, the auditors should disclose in the scope section of the report the applicable standard that was not followed, the reasons therefor, and how not following the standard affected, or could have affected, the results of the attestation engagement.

6.27 When the report on the attestation engagement is submitted to comply with a legal, regulatory, or contractual requirement for a GAGAS audit, it should specifically cite GAGAS. An audited entity receiving a GAGAS attestation report may also need a report on the attestation engagement for purposes other than to comply with requirements calling for a GAGAS audit. When a GAGAS attestation engagement is the basis for an auditor's subsequent report under the AICPA standards, it would be advantageous to users of the subsequent report for the auditor's report to include the information on compliance with laws

and regulations and internal control that is required by GAGAS but not required by AICPA standards. To reissue essentially the same report omitting information regarding compliance with laws and regulations and internal control is not in the public interest.

#### Reporting on Internal Control and on Fraud,

#### Illegal Acts, and Other Noncompliance

6.28 An additional reporting standard for attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

The report on an attestation engagement should disclose deficiencies in internal control, including internal control over compliance with laws and regulations, that are material to the subject matter or assertion. Fraud, illegal acts, and other noncompliance often result from the lack, or circumvention, of internal control. Accordingly, auditors should also disclose in the report on the attestation engagement instances of fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance that are material to the subject matter or the assertion. <sup>10</sup>

6.29 Auditors should place their findings in proper perspective by providing a description of the objectives, scope, and methodology used to conduct the work. To give the reader a basis for judging the prevalence and consequences of these findings, the instances identified should be related to the population or the number of cases examined and be quantified in terms of dollar value, if appropriate.

16

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Auditors need not report information about fraud or an illegal act that is clearly inconsequential. However, these matters should be brought to the attention of management of the audited entity.

6.30 To the extent possible, auditors should present findings to identify the elements of criteria, condition, and effect, as well as cause when problems are found. In addition, auditors should provide recommendations for corrective action if auditors are able to sufficiently develop the findings. However, the elements needed for a finding depend entirely on the scope and objectives of the attestation engagement, and, as a result, may not always have all of the elements fully developed. At a minimum, auditors should identify the condition, criteria, and possible effect to provide sufficient information to federal, state, and local officials to assist them in taking corrective action.

6.31 When auditors detect deficiencies in internal control that are not material to the subject matter or assertion or conclude, on the basis of evidence obtained, that fraud, an illegal act, or other noncompliance either has occurred or is likely to have occurred, they should communicate relevant information to officials of the audited entity, preferably in writing.

Auditors should include in their audit documentation evidence of all communications to officials of the audited entity about deficiencies in internal control or indications of fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance.

#### Views of Responsible Officials

6.32 An additional reporting standard for attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Whether a particular act is, in fact, illegal may have to await final determination by a court of law. Thus, when auditors disclose matters that have led them to conclude that an illegal act is likely to have occurred, they should not imply that they have made a determination of illegality.

If the auditor's report discloses significant deficiencies, auditors should report the views of responsible officials concerning the findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as corrections planned.

6.33 One of the most effective ways to ensure that a report is fair, complete, and objective is to obtain advance review and comments by responsible officials of the audited entity and others, as may be appropriate. Including the views of responsible officials produces a report that shows not only what was found and what the auditors think about it but also what the responsible persons think about it and what they plan to do about it.

6.34 Auditors should normally request that the responsible officials' views on significant findings, conclusions, and recommendations be submitted in writing. Oral comments are acceptable as well, and, in some cases, may be the only or most expeditious way to obtain comments. Cases in which obtaining oral comments can be effective include when there is a time-critical need to meet a user's needs; the auditors have worked closely with the responsible officials throughout the conduct of the work and the parties are very familiar with the findings and issues addressed in the draft product; or the auditor does not expect major disagreements with the draft report's findings, conclusions, and recommendations, or perceive any major controversies with regard to the issues discussed in the draft report. Auditors should prepare a summary of the officials' oral comments and provide a copy of the summary to management of the audited entity to verify that the comments are accurately stated.

6.35 Comments should be fairly and objectively evaluated and recognized, as appropriate, in the final report. Comments, such as a promise or plan for corrective action, should be noted but should not be accepted as justification for dropping a significant finding or a related recommendation.

6.36 When the comments oppose the report's findings, conclusions, or recommendations, and are not, in the auditors' opinion, valid, the auditors should state their reasons for disagreeing with the comments. The auditors' disagreement should be stated in a fair and objective manner. Conversely, the auditors should modify their report as necessary if they find the comments valid. Auditors may wish to attach the comment letter to the audit report to provide the reader with both points of view.

## Privileged and Confidential Information

6.37 An additional reporting standard for attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

If certain pertinent information is prohibited from general disclosure, the report on the attestation engagement should state the nature of the information omitted and the requirement that makes the omission necessary.

6.38 Certain information may be prohibited from general disclosure by federal, state, or local laws or regulations. Such information may be provided on a need-to-know basis only to

persons authorized by law or regulation to receive it. Additional circumstances associated with public safety and security concerns could also justify the exclusion of certain information in the report. For example, information related to computer security for a particular program should be excluded from the report because of the potential damage that could be caused by the misuse of this information. In such circumstances, auditors may issue a limited official-use report containing such information and distribute the report only to those parties responsible for acting on the auditors' recommendations.

#### Report Issuance and Distribution

6.39 An additional reporting standard for attestation engagements performed in accordance with GAGAS is:

Auditors should submit written reports on the attestation engagement to the appropriate officials of the audited entity and to the appropriate officials of the organizations requiring or arranging for the engagement, including external funding organizations, unless legal restrictions prevent it. Auditors should also send copies of the reports to other officials who have legal oversight authority or who may be responsible for acting on audit findings and recommendations and to others authorized to receive such reports. Unless the report is restricted by law or regulation, auditors should ensure that copies be made available for public inspection.

- 6.40 Reports should be distributed in a timely manner to officials interested in the results. Such officials include those designated by law or regulation to receive such reports, those responsible for acting on the findings and recommendations contained in the report, those of other levels of government that have provided assistance to the audited entity, and legislators.
- 6.41 If the subject of the attestation engagement involves material that is classified for security purposes or not releasable to particular parties or the public for other valid reasons, auditors may limit the report distribution. Although AICPA standards require that a report on an engagement to evaluate an assertion that has been prepared on agreed-upon criteria or on an engagement to apply agreed-upon procedures should contain a statement limiting its use to the parties who have agreed upon such criteria or procedures, such a statement does not require that the report distribution be limited.
- 6.42 When public accountants are engaged, the engaging organization should ensure that the report is distributed appropriately. If the public accountants are to make the distribution, the engagement agreement should indicate which officials or organizations should receive the report and other steps being taken to ensure the availability of the report for public inspection.
- 6.43 Internal auditors should follow their entity's own arrangements and statutory requirements for distribution. Usually, they report to their entity's top manager, who is responsible for distribution of the report. Further distribution of reports outside the organization should be made in accordance with applicable laws, rules, regulations, or policy.

#### CHAPTER 67

#### FIELD WORK STANDARDS FOR PERFORMANCE AUDITS

#### **PURPOSE**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

7.1 6.1 This chapter prescribes field work standards for performance audits and provides guidance to auditors conducting performance audits in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS). The field work standards for performance audits relate to planning the audit, supervising staff, obtaining sufficient, competent, and relevant evidence, and preparing audit documentation. These standards also apply to some financial related audits, as discussed in chapter 4.

#### **PLANNING**

7.2 6.2 The first field work standard *related to planning* for performance audits *conducted in accordance with GAGAS* is

Work is to be adequately planned.

7.3 6.3 In planning the audit, auditors should define the audit's objectives, and as well as the scope, and methodology to achieve those objectives. 6.6 Planning should continue throughout the audit. Audit objectives, scope, and methodologies are not determined in isolation. Auditors determine these three elements of the audit plan together, as the considerations in determining each often overlap. Planning is a continuous process throughout the audit. Therefore, auditors should consider the need to make adjustments to the audit objectives, scope, and methodology as work is being completed.

7.4 6.3 The objectives are what the audit is *intended* to accomplish. They identify the audit subjects and performance aspects to be included, as well as the potential finding and reporting elements that the auditors expect to develop. Audit objectives can be thought of as questions about the program that auditors seek to answer. (See chapter 2.)

6.10 [Paragraph not used.] One approach to setting audit objectives is to relate the elements of a program to the types of performance audits discussed in chapter 2. For example, audits concerned with economy could focus on whether efforts: Were resources were obtained at an optimal cost and at an appropriate level of quality? Audits concerned with efficiency could focus on the program operations or the relationship between efforts (resources used) and either outputs or outcomes to determine the cost per unit of output or outcome. Program audits could be concerned with determining whether program outcomes met specified goals or whether

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>See discussion of the elements of a finding in paragraphs 7.46 6.49 through 7.49 6.52.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS) are standards for audit of government organizations, programs, activities, and functions. This chapter uses only the term "program"; however, the concepts presented also apply to audits of organizations, activities, and functions services.

outcomes were better than they would have been without the program. Any type of performance audit could encompass program operations if auditors are looking for reasons why the program was successful or not.

7.5 6.3 Scope is the boundary of the audit and should be directly tied to the audit objectives.

For example, the scope defines parameters of the audit such addresses such things as the period of time reviewed, the availability of necessary documentation or records, and the number of locations to be covered at which field work will be conducted.

7.6 6.3 The methodology comprises the work involved in data gathering and analyzing data in analytical methods auditors will do to achieve the objectives. Audit procedures are the specific steps and tests auditors will carry out to address the audit objectives. 6.4 Auditors should design the methodology to provide sufficient, competent, and relevant evidence to achieve the objectives of the audit. Methodology includes not only both the types and extent of the auditors' procedures, but also their extent (for example sample size). audit procedures used to achieve the audit objectives. Auditors may use different methodologies drawn from a wide variety of disciplines.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>-</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> If the auditor chooses to apply or use standards or methodologies developed by other professional organizations when performing work under GAGAS, the auditor should also apply the standards in this chapter as appropriate. Even if auditors do not follow such other standards and methodologies, they may still serve as a useful source of guidance to auditors in planning their work under GAGAS. However, if auditors decide to perform their work in accordance with the standards for attestation engagements issued by the AICPA, auditors should apply the additional GAGAS standards for attestation engagements contained in chapter 6.

- 7.7 6.5 In planning, a performance audit, auditors should: Planning should be documented and should include
- a.  $c \in C$  on sider *ing the* significance *of various programs* and the needs of potential users of the audit report: ( $s \in C$  on a  $c \in C$  on  $c \in C$  o
- **b.** *o*Obtain*ing* an understanding of the program to be audited: (*s*See paragraphs 7.11 6.9 through 6.10);
- dc. Consider management controls: obtaining an understanding of internal control as it relates to the specific objectives and scope of the audit (sSee paragraphs 7.12 6.39 through 7.17 6.45);
- cd. consider designing the audit methodology and procedures to test compliance with legal and regulatory requirements of the program to be audited that are significant to the specific objectives and scope of the audit (sSee paragraphs 7.17 6.26 through 7.20 6.38);
- e. *i*Hdentify*ing the* criteria needed to evaluate matters subject to audit: (sSee paragraph 7.21 6.11);
- **f.** Identify significant findings and recommendations from *considering the results of* previous audits that could affect the current audit objectives. Auditors should determine if management has corrected the conditions causing those findings and implemented those recommendations

(sSee paragraphs  $7.22 \cdot 6.12$  and  $7.23 \cdot 6.13$ );

- g. itdentifying potential sources of data that could be used as audit evidence and consider the validity and reliability of these data, including data collected by the audited entity, data generated by the auditors, or data provided by third parties. (sSee paragraphs 6.53 through 6.62 7.24);
- h. *c*Consider*ing* whether the work of other auditors and experts may be used to satisfy some of the auditors' objectives: (sSee paragraphs 7.25 6.14 and through 7.27 6.16);
- i. pProvideing appropriate and sufficient staff and other resources to do perform the audit (sSee paragraphs 7.28 through 7.31 6.17 and 6.18);
- j. communicating general information concerning the planning and conduct of the audit to management officials responsible for the program being audited, and others as applicable (see paragraphs 7.32 and 7.33); and
- jk. Prepare a written audit plan. documenting planning decisions. (See paragraphs 7.34 6.19 through 7.36 6.21.)

### **Program** Significance and User Needs

- 7.8 6.7 Auditors should consider significance in planning, performing, and reporting on performance audits. The significance of a matter is its relative importance to the audit objectives and potential users of the audit report. Qualitative, as well as quantitative, factors are important in determining significance. Qualitative factors can include The significance of a matter is its relative importance to the audit objectives and potential users of the audit report. Auditors should consider the significance of a program or program component and the potential use that will be made of the audit results or report as they plan a performance audit. Indicators of significance and/or use to consider include
- **a.** visibility and sensitivity of the program under audit,
- **b.** newness of the program or changes in its conditions,
- **c.** role of the audit in providing information that can improve public accountability and decision-making, and
- **d.** level and extent of review or other forms of independent oversight.
- 7.9 6.8 One group of users of the auditors' report is government officials who may have authorized or requested the audit. Another important user of the auditors' report is the *entity*

being audited auditee, which is responsible for acting on the auditors' recommendations. Other potential users of the auditors' report include government legislators or officials (other than those who may have authorized or requested the audit), the media, interest groups, and individual citizens. These other users may have, iIn addition to an interest in the program, potential users may have an ability to influence the conduct of the program. Thus, aAn awareness of these potential users' interests and influence can help auditors understand why the program operates the way it does. This awareness can also help auditors judge whether possible findings could be significant to these other various possible users.

### **Understanding the Program**

7.10 6.9 Auditors should obtain an understanding of the program to be audited to help assess, among other matters, the significance of possible audit objectives and the feasibility of achieving them. The auditors' understanding may come from knowledge they already have about the program and or knowledge they gain from inquiries and observations they make in planning the audit. The extent and breadth of those inquiries and observations will vary among audits based on the audit objectives, as will the need to understand individual aspects of the program, such as the following.

**a.** <u>Laws and regulations</u>: Government programs usually are created by law and are subject to more specific laws and regulations than the private sector. For example, laws and regulations usually set forth what is to be done, who is to do it, the purpose to be achieved, the population to

be served, and how much can be spent on what. Thus, understanding the laws *and the legislative history* establishing a program can be essential to understanding the program itself. Obtaining that understanding may also be *is also* a necessary step in identifying provisions of laws and regulations significant to audit objectives.

b. Purpose and goals: Purpose is the result or effect that is intended or desired from a program's operation, and can exist without being expressly stated. Goals quantify the level of performance intended or desired. Legislatures set usually establish the program purpose when they establish a provide authority for the program. Entity officials may provide more detailed guidance on program purpose to supplement the authorizing legislation.; however, management is Entity officials are expected sometimes asked to set goals for program efforts, performance and operations, outputs, and outcomes including both outcome and output goals. Auditors may use the stated program purpose and goals as criteria for assessing program performance or may develop additional criteria or best practices to compare the program with.

6.41c. Internal control<sup>4</sup>: Management Internal controls, often referred to as management controls, in the broadest sense; includes the plan of organization, methods, and procedures adopted by management to meet its missions; goals, and objectives, and in doing so, supports performance-based management. Management Internal controls includes the processes for planning, organizing, directing, and controlling program operations. They It includes the systems for measuring, reporting, and monitoring program performance. Internal control also

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The term internal control in this document is synonymous with management control.

serves as the first line of defense in safeguarding assets and preventing and detecting errors and fraud. Paragraphs 7.11 through 7.16 contain guidance pertaining to internal control.

ed. Efforts: Efforts are the amount of resources (in terms of money, material, personnel, and so forth) that are put into a program. These resources may come from within or outside the entity operating the program. Measures of efforts can have a number of dimensions, such as cost, timing, and quality. Examples of measures of efforts are dollars, employee-hours, and square feet of building space.

**de.** Program operations: Program operations are the strategies, processes, and activities **management** the auditee uses to convert efforts into outputs. Program operations are subject to internal controls, which are discussed later in this chapter.

ef. Outputs: Outputs are the quantity of goods and services provided. Examples of measures of output are tons of solid waste processed, number of students graduated, and number of students graduated who have met a specified standard of achievement. Outputs represent the quantity of a good or service produced by a program. For example, an output measure for a job training program could be the number of persons completing training, and an output measure for an aviation safety inspection program could be the number of safety inspections completed.

fg. Outcomes: Outcomes are accomplishments or results that occur (at least partially) because of services provided. Outcomes can be viewed as ranging from immediate outcomes to long-

term outcomes. For example, an immediate outcome of a job training program and an indicator of its effectiveness might be the number of program graduates placed in jobs. That program's ultimate outcome and test of its effectiveness depends on whether program graduates are more likely to remain employed than similar persons not in the program. Outcomes may be intended or unintended, and they may be influenced by cultural, economic, physical, or technological factors external to the program. Auditors may use approaches drawn from the field of program evaluation to isolate the effects of the program from those of other influences. Outcomes are accomplishments or results of programs. For example, an outcome measure for a job training program could be the percentage of trained persons obtaining a job and still in the work place after a specified period of time. Examples of outcome measures for an aviation safety inspection program could be the percentage reduction in significant safety problems found in subsequent inspections and/or the percentage of significant problems deemed corrected in follow-up inspections. Such outcome measures show progress in achieving the stated program purposes of helping unemployable citizens get and keep jobs and improving the safety of aviation operations. Auditors should be aware that outcomes may be influenced by cultural, economic, physical, or technological factors outside the program. Auditors may use approaches drawn from the field of program evaluation to try to isolate the effects of the program from these other influences.

7.11 6.39 Auditors should obtain an understanding of management the internal controls environment, as well as specific internal controls, that are relevant significant to the audit objectives, including internal control over compliance with legal and regulatory requirements, and consider whether the internal controls have been placed in operation. Auditors also need to consider whether any reliance will be placed on internal controls in designing audit procedure. If so, auditors should include specific tests of the effectiveness of internal control and consider the results in designing audit procedures. 6.40 Management is responsible for establishing effective management internal controls. The lack of administrative continuity in government units because of continuing changes in elected legislative bodies and in administrative organizations increases the need for effective management internal controls.

7.12 6.41 The following classification of management *internal* controls is intended to help auditors focus on *better* understanding management *internal* controls and in determineing their significance to the audit objectives.

a. *Effectiveness and efficiency of program operations*: Controls over program operations include policies and procedures that management has implemented to

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Refer to internal control guidance developed for the private sector, <u>Internal Control – Integrated Framework</u>, published by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO). The publication, <u>Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government</u> (GAO/AIMD-00-21.3.1, November 1999), which incorporates the relevant guidance developed by COSO, provides definitions and fundamental concepts pertaining to internal control at the federal level and may be useful to other auditors at any level of government. The related <u>Internal Control Management and Evaluation Tool</u> (GAO-01-1008G, August 2001), based on the federal internal control standards, provides a systematic, organized, and structured approach to assessing the internal control structure.

reasonably ensure that a program meets its objectives *and that unintended actions do not result, such as improper payments*. Understanding these controls can help auditors understand the program operations that convert efforts to outputs *or outcomes*.

- **b.** <u>Validity and reliability of data</u>: Controls over the validity and reliability of data include policies and procedures that management has implemented to reasonably ensure that valid and reliable data are obtained, maintained, and fairly disclosed in reports. These controls help assure management that it is getting valid and reliable information about whether programs are operating properly *on an ongoing basis*. Understanding these controls can help auditors (1) assess the risk that the data gathered by the entity may not be valid <del>and or reliable and (2) design appropriate tests of the data</del>.
- c. Compliance with *applicable* laws and regulations: Controls over compliance with *applicable* laws and regulations include policies and procedures that management has implemented to reasonably ensure that resource use *program implementation* is consistent with laws and regulations. Understanding the controls relevant to compliance with those laws and regulations that the auditors have determined are significant can help auditors assess the risk of illegal acts.
- 7.13 d. Safeguarding of resources: A subset of these categories of internal control is the safeguarding of resources. Controls over the safeguarding of resources include policies and procedures that management has implemented to reasonably ensure that resources are safeguarded against waste, loss, and misuse prevent or promptly detect unauthorized

acquisition, use, or disposition of resources. Understanding these controls can help auditors plan economy and efficiency audits.

- 7.14 6.42 Auditors can obtain an understanding of management internal controls through inquiries, observations, inspection of documents and records, or review of other auditors' reports. The procedures auditors perform to obtain an understanding of management internal controls will vary among audits. One factor influencing the extent of these procedures is the auditors' knowledge about management internal controls gained in prior audits. Also, the need to understand management internal controls will depend on the particular aspects of the program the auditors consider in setting objectives, scope, and methodology. The following are examples of how the auditors' understanding of management internal controls can influence the audit plan.
- a. <u>Audit Oo</u>bjectives: Poorly controlled aspects of a program have *a* higher risk of failure, so they may be more significant than others in terms of where auditors would want to focus their efforts.
- b. <u>Audit Sscope</u>: Knowledge of the internal control environment and the status of Poor controls in a certain location may lead auditors to target their efforts there.
- c. <u>Audit Mmethodology</u>: Effective controls over collecting, summarizing, and reporting data may enable auditors to limit the extent of their direct testing of data validity and reliability. In contrast, *evidence suggesting ineffective* poor controls may lead auditors to perform more direct

testing of the data, look for data from outside the entity, or develop their own data.

7.15 6.43 The need to test When management internal controls depends on their significance are significant to the audit objectives, auditors should plan to obtain sufficient evidence to support their judgments about those controls The following are examples of circumstances where management internal controls can be significant to audit objectives:

- **a.** In determining the cause of unsatisfactory performance, if that unsatisfactory performance could result from weaknesses in specific management *internal* controls.
- **b.** When assessing the validity and reliability of performance measures developed by the audited entity:, *e*Effective management *internal* controls over collecting, summarizing, and reporting data will help ensure valid and reliable performance measures.

7.16 6.44 Internal auditing is an important part of management *internal* control. When an assessment of management *internal* controls is called for, the work of the internal auditors can be used to help provide reasonable assurance that management *internal* controls are functioning properly and to prevent duplication of effort.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The <u>Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government</u> (GAO/AIMD-00-21.3.1, November 1999), is one source of established criteria auditors can use to support their judgments and conclusions about internal control.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Many government entities have these activities identified by other names, such as inspection, appraisal, investigation, organization and methods, or management analysis. These activities assist management by reviewing selected functions.

6.45 Considering the wide variety of government programs, no single pattern for internal audit activities can be specified. Many government entities have these activities identified by other names, such as inspection, appraisal, investigation, organization and methods, or management analysis. These activities assist management by reviewing selected functions.

Considering Legal, and Regulatory, and

**Other Compliance** Requirements

7.17 6.26 and 28 When laws, regulations, and other compliance requirements such as provisions of contracts or grant agreements are significant to the audit objectives, auditors should design the audit to provide reasonable assurance about compliance with them. This requires determining if which laws, and regulations, and other compliance requirements are significant to the audit objectives and, if they are, assessing the risk that significant illegal acts noncompliance could occur. Based on that risk assessment, the auditors design and perform procedures to provide reasonable assurance of detecting significant illegal acts instances of noncompliance. (See paragraphs 7.59 through 7.63 for a discussion of evidence indicative of fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance.)

7.18 6.37 Auditors may find it necessary to rely on the work of work with legal counsel in to (1) determineing those laws and regulations that are significant to the audit objectives, (2) designing tests of compliance with laws and regulations, and or (3) evaluateing the results of those tests.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>75</sup> Hlegal acts are violations of laws or regulations. The term noncompliance includes not only illegal acts resulting from violations of laws and regulations, but also violations of provisions of contracts or grant agreements.

Auditors also may find it necessary to rely on the work of legal counsel when audit objectives require testing compliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements. Depending on the circumstances of the audit, auditors may find it necessary to obtain information on compliance matters from others, such as investigative staff, *other* audit *organizations or* officials of other government entities that provided assistance to the *audited entity* auditee, or the applicable law enforcement authority.

7.19 6.29 It is not practical to set precise standards for determining if laws, and regulations, or other compliance requirements are significant to audit objectives because government programs are subject to so many laws, and regulations, and other compliance requirements, and audit objectives vary widely. However, auditors may find the following approach helpful in making that determination:

- **a.** Reduce each audit objective to questions about specific aspects of the program being audited (that is, purpose and goals, *internal control*, efforts, program operations, outputs, and outcomes, as discussed in paragraph 7.10 6.9).
- b. Identify laws, and regulations, and other compliance requirements that directly address relate to specific aspects of the program included in the audit objectives' questions that reflect the audit objectives.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>87</sup> Paragraphs 7.25 6.14 through 7.27 6.16 discuss relying on considering the work of others.

- c. Determine if violations of those laws, and regulations, or other compliance requirements could significantly affect the auditors' answers to the questions encompassed in that relate to the audit objectives. If they could, then those laws, and regulations, and other compliance requirements are likely to be significant to the audit objectives.
- 6.30 The following are examples of types of laws and regulations that can be significant to the various types of performance audit objectives of economy and efficiency and program results audits and of program audits.
- **a.** Economy and efficiency: Laws and regulations that could significantly affect the acquisition, protection, and use of the entity's resources, and the quantity, quality, timeliness, and cost of the products and services it produces and delivers.
- b. <u>Program Results</u>: Laws and regulations pertaining to the purpose of the program, the manner in which it *the program* is to be delivered, and the population it is to serve.
- 7.20 6.31 In planning tests of compliance with significant laws, and regulations, and other compliance requirements, auditors should assess the risk that illegal acts noncompliance could occur. That risk may be affected by such factors as the complexity of the laws and regulations or their newness. The auditors' assessment of risk includes consideration of whether the entity has controls that are effective in preventing or detecting illegal acts noncompliance. Management is responsible for establishing effective controls to ensure compliance with laws and regulations, as

well as other compliance requirements such as provisions of contracts or grant agreements. If auditors obtain sufficient evidence of the effectiveness of these controls, they can reduce the extent of their tests of compliance.

[Paragraphs 6.32 through 6.38 have been moved and renumbered as paragraphs 7.59 through 7.63.]

Criteria

7.21 6.11 Criteria are the standards, measures, or expectations of what should exist, best practices, or benchmarks against which performance is compared or evaluated used to determine whether a program meets or exceeds expectations. Criteria, one of the elements of a finding, provide a context for understanding the results of the audit. (See paragraphs 7.45 through 7.48 for a discussion on the other elements of a finding.) The audit plan, where possible, should state the criteria to be used. In selecting criteria, auditors have a responsibility to use criteria that are reasonable, attainable, and relevant to the matters being audited objectives of the performance audit. The following are some examples of possible criteria:

- a. purpose or goals prescribed by law or regulation or set by management,
- b. policies and procedures established by management of the audited entity,

bc. technically developed standards or norms,

ed. expert opinions,

**de.** prior years' performance,

ef. performance of similar entities, and

fg. performance in the private sector, or.

h. best practices of leading organizations.

Audit Follow-up

Considering the Results of Previous Audits

7.22 6.12 Auditors should identify significant findings and recommendations from previous audits that are relevant to could affect the audit objectives. Auditors should follow up on these significant findings and recommendations to determine whether timely and appropriate corrective actions have been taken by auditee officials. The audit report should disclose the status of uncorrected significant findings and recommendations from prior audits that affect the audit objectives. Auditors should consider the results of previous audits and follow-up on known

significant findings and recommendations<sup>9</sup> that directly relate to the audit objectives of the performance audit. Auditors should also be alert to the status of relevant findings and recommendations identified in other available audits and studies by other organizations as well. For example, an audit report on an entity's computerized information systems may contain significant findings that could relate to the audit if the entity uses such systems to process its accounting or other information the auditors plan on using. In any event, auditors need to make judgments about the extent of follow-up needed and the appropriate disclosure of uncorrected significant findings and recommendations from prior audits that affect the audit objectives.

7.23 6.13. Much of the benefit from audit work is not in the findings reported or the recommendations made, but in their effective resolution. Providing continuing attention to significant findings and recommendations is important to ensure that the benefits of audit work are realized. Ultimately, the benefits of audit work occur when audit findings are resolved through meaningful and effective corrective action taken in response to the auditors' findings and recommendations. Officials of the audited entity are responsible for resolving audit findings and recommendations directed to them; and for having a process to track their status can help it fulfill this responsibility. If management does officials of the audited entity do not have such a process, auditors may wish to establish their own process. Continued attention to significant findings and recommendations can help auditors assure that the benefits of their work are realized.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Significant findings and recommendations are those matters that, if not corrected, could affect the results of the auditors' work and users' conclusions about those results.

Identifying **Sources of** Audit Evidence

7.24 6.5g. In identifying potential sources of data that could be used as audit evidence, auditors

should consider the validity and reliability of these data, including data collected by the audited

entity, data generated by the auditors, or data provided by third parties, as well as the sufficiency

and relevance of the evidence. (See paragraphs 7.41 through 7.44 for guidance concerning

evidence.)

Considering Others' Work

of Other Auditors

7.25 6.14 Auditors should determine if other auditors have previously done, or are doing, audits

of the program or the entity that operates it. Whether other auditors have done performance

audits, or financial audits, or attestation engagements, they the other auditors may be useful

sources of information for planning and performing the audit. If other auditors have identified

areas that warrant further study, their work may influence the auditors' selection of objectives.

The availability of other auditors' work may also influence the selection of methodology, as the

auditors may be able to rely on that work to limit the extent of their own testing.

7.26 6.15 If auditors intend to rely on the work of other auditors, they should perform procedures

regarding the specific work to be relied on that provide a sufficient basis for that reliance.

21

Auditors can obtain evidence of *concerning the* other auditors' qualifications<sup>310</sup> and independence through prior experience, inquiry, and/or review of the other auditors' external quality control review report. Auditors can determine the sufficiency, relevance, and competence of other auditors' evidence by reviewing their report, audit program, or working papers audit documentation, and/or by performing making supplemental tests of their the other auditors' work. The nature and extent of evidence needed will depend on the significance of the other auditors' work and on whether the extent to which the auditors will refer to rely on that work in their report.

7.27 6.16 Auditors face similar considerations when relying on using the work of nonauditors (consultants, experts, specialists, and so forth). In addition, auditors should obtain an understanding of the methods and significant assumptions used by the nonauditors. (See paragraph 3.xx for independence considerations when relying on the work of others.)

Staff and Other Resources

7.28 6.17 Staff planning should include, among other things,

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>103-</sup>Auditors from another country engaged to conduct audits in their country should meet the professional qualifications to practice under that country's laws and regulations or other acceptable standards, such as those issued by the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions. Also see the International Federation of Accountants' *International Standards on Auditing*.

- a. Aassigning staff with the appropriate *collective knowledge*, skills, and *experience* knowledge for the job-,
- **b.** Aassigning an adequate number of experienced staff and supervisors to the audit. Consultants should be used when necessary.
- c. Pproviding for on-the-job training of staff-, and
- d. engaging specialists when necessary.
- 7.29 6.18 The availability of staff and other resources and the need for specialized skills are is an important considerations in establishing the objectives, scope, and methodology. For example, limitations on travel funds may preclude auditors from visiting certain critical locations, or lack of expertise in a particular methodology or with computerized information systems may preclude auditors from undertaking certain objectives. Auditors may be able to overcome such limitations by use of using staff from any existing local field offices of the audit entity or by engaging consultants with the necessary expertise.
- 7.30 If the use of a specialist is planned, auditors should have sufficient knowledge to
- a. articulate the objectives required of the specialist,

b. evaluate whether the specified procedures will meet auditors' objectives, and

c. evaluate the results of the procedures applied as they relate to other planned audit procedures.

7.31 Auditors without sufficient knowledge to perform the functions listed above may have to engage a consultant for quality control purposes for the areas related to the specialist's work.

# **Communicating With Management and Others**

7.32 Auditors should communicate information about the specific nature of the audit, as well as general information concerning the planning and conduct of the performance audit, to the various parties involved in the audit to help them understand the objectives, time frames, and any data needs. Such parties may include

a. the head of the audited entity,

b. the audit committee or, in the absence of an audit committee, the board of directors or other equivalent oversight body,

c. the individual who possesses a sufficient level of authority and responsibility for the program or activity being audited; and

d. the individuals contracting for or requesting audit services, such as contracting officials or legislative members or staff, if applicable.

7.33 Auditors should use their professional judgment to determine the form, content, and frequency of the communication, although written communication is preferred, and should document the communication. Auditors may use an engagement letter, if appropriate, to communicate the information.

#### Written Audit Plan

## **Documenting Planning Decisions**

7.34 6.19 A written audit plan should be prepared for each audit. The form and content of the written audit plan will vary among audits. The plan but should include an audit program or project plan, a memorandum, or other appropriate documentation of key decisions about the audit objectives, scope, and methodology and of the auditors' basis for those decisions. It should be updated, as necessary, to reflect any significant changes to the plan made during the audit.

7.35 6.20 Documenting the audit plan is an opportunity for the auditors to review the work done in planning the audit to determine whether

**a.** the proposed audit objectives are likely to result in a useful report,

- **b.** the proposed audit scope and methodology are adequate to satisfy the audit objectives, and
- c. sufficient staff and other resources are have been made available to perform the audit and to meet expected timeframes for completing the work.
- 7.36 6.21 Written audit plans may include *the following*:
- **a.** Information about the legal authority for the audited program, its history and current objectives, its principal locations, and other background that can help auditors understand and carry out the audit plan.
- **b.** Information about the responsibilities *of each member* of the audit team (such as preparing audit programs, conducting audit work, supervising *and reviewing* audit work, drafting reports, handling auditee comments *from officials of the audited program*, and processing the final report), which can help auditors when the work is conducted at several different locations. In these audits, use of comparable audit methods and procedures can help make the data obtained from participating locations comparable.
- **c.** Audit programs describing procedures to accomplish the audit objectives and providing a systematic basis for assigning work to staff and for summarizing the work performed.

**d.** The general format of the audit report and the types of information to be included, which can help auditors focus their field work on the information to be reported.

#### **SUPERVISION**

7.37 6.22 The second field work standard for performance audits is:

Staff are to be properly supervised.

7.38 6.23 Supervision involves directing the efforts of *staff assigned to*-auditors and others<sup>4</sup> who are involved in the audit to determine whether *ensure that* the audit objectives are being accomplished. Elements of supervision include instructing *providing sufficient guidance to* staff members, keeping informed of significant problems encountered, reviewing the work performed, and providing effective on-the-job training.

7.39 6.24 Supervisors should satisfy themselves that staff members clearly understand what work they are to do, why the work is to be conducted, and what it the work is expected to accomplish. With experienced staff, supervisors may outline the scope of the work and leave details to assistants the staff. With a less experienced staff, supervisors may have to specify not only audit

<sup>4</sup>Others involved in accomplishing the objectives of the audit include external consultants and specialists.

procedures to be performed as well as techniques for gathering and analyzing data but also how to gather it.

7.40 6.25 The nature of the review of audit work may vary depending on the significance of the work or the experience of the staff. For example, it may be appropriate to have experienced staff auditors review much of the work of other staff with similar experience.

#### **EVIDENCE**

7.41 6.46 The fifth third field work standard for performance audits is:

Sufficient, *relevant*, *and* competent, and relevant evidence is to be obtained to afford a reasonable basis for the auditors' findings and conclusions.

7.42 A large part of auditors' work on an audit concerns obtaining and evaluating evidence that ultimately supports their judgments and conclusions pertaining to the audit objectives. In evaluating evidence, auditors consider whether they have obtained the evidence necessary to achieve specific audit objectives. When internal control or compliance requirements are significant to the audit objectives, auditors should also collect and evaluate evidence relating to controls or compliance.

7.43 6.47 Evidence may be categorized as physical, documentary, testimonial, and analytical. Physical evidence Physical evidence is obtained by auditors' direct inspection or observation of people, property, or events. Such evidence may be documented in memoranda, photographs, drawings, charts, maps, or physical samples. Documentary evidence Documentary evidence consists of created information such as letters, contracts, accounting records, invoices, and management information on performance. Testimonial evidence Testimonial evidence is obtained through inquiries, interviews, or questionnaires. Analytical evidence Analytical evidence includes computations, comparisons, separation of information into components, and rational arguments.

7.44 6.48 The guidance in the following paragraphs is intended to help auditors judge the quality and quantity of evidence needed to satisfy audit objectives. Paragraphs 7.45 6.49 through 7.48 6.52 describe the elements of an audit finding. Paragraphs 7.49 6.53 through 7.58 6.62 provide guidance to help auditors determine what constitutes sufficient, competent, and relevant evidence to support their findings and conclusions. Finally, paragraphs 6.63 through 6.65 provide guidance on how to document that evidence.

#### **Audit Findings**

**7.45** 6.49 Audit findings often have been regarded as containing the elements of criteria, condition, and effect, plus cause when problems are found. However, the elements needed for a finding depend entirely on the objectives of the audit. Thus, a finding or set of findings is

complete to the extent that the audit objectives are satisfied and the report clearly relates those objectives to the finding's elements. Criteria are discussed in paragraph 7.21, and 6.11 the other elements of a finding--condition, effect, and cause--are discussed in the following paragraphs.

7.46 6.50 Condition: Condition is a situation that exists. It has been determined and documented during the audit.

7.47 6.51 Effect: *Effect* has two meanings, which depend on the audit objectives. When the auditors' objectives include identifying the actual or potential consequences of a condition that varies (either positively or negatively) from the criteria identified in the audit, "effect" is a measure of those consequences. Auditors often use effect in this sense to demonstrate the need for corrective action in response to identified problems. When the auditors' objectives include estimating the extent to which a program has caused changes in physical, social, or economic conditions, "effect" is a measure of the impact achieved by the program. Here, effect is the extent to which positive or negative changes in actual physical, social, or economic conditions can be identified and attributed to program operations.

7.48 6.52 <u>Cause</u>: Like effect, <u>cause</u> cause also has two meanings, which depend on the audit objectives. When the auditors' objectives include explaining why the poor (or good) a particular type of positive or negative performance determined identified in the audit occurred happened, the reasons for that performance are referred to as "cause." Identifying the cause of problems can assist auditors in making constructive recommendations for correction. Because problems can

result from a number of plausible factors *or multiple causes*, the recommendation can be more persuasive if auditors can clearly demonstrate and explain with evidence and reasoning the link between the problems and the factor or factors they identified as the *underlying* cause. When the auditors' objectives include estimating the program's effect on changes in physical, social, or economic conditions, they seek evidence of the extent to which the program itself is the "cause" of those changes.

#### Tests of Evidence

7.49 6.53 Evidence should be sufficient, competent, and relevant to support a sound basis for audit findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

a. Evidence is sufficient if there is enough of it should be sufficient to support the auditors' findings. In determining the sufficiency of evidence, auditors should ensure that it may be helpful to ask such questions as: Is there enough evidence exists to persuade a reasonable knowledgeable person of the validity of the findings?. When appropriate, statistical methods may be used to establish sufficiency.

b. Evidence is competent competent if to the extent that it is consistent with fact (that is, evidence is competent if it is valid and reliable). In assessing the competence of evidence, auditors should consider such factors as whether the evidence is accurate, authoritative,

timely, and authentic. When appropriate, auditors may use statistical methods to derive competent evidence.

c. Evidence used to support a finding is relevant relevant if it has a logical, sensible relationship to the issue being addressed that finding.

7.50 6.54 The following presumptions are useful in judging the competence of evidence. However, these presumptions are not to be considered sufficient in themselves to determine competence. The amount and kinds of evidence required to support auditors' conclusions should be based on auditors' professional judgment.

ba. Evidence obtained developed under an effective system of when internal controls are effective is more competent than that evidence obtained when where such controls are weak or nonexistent. Auditors should therefore be particularly careful in cases where controls are weak or nonexistent.

**cb.** Evidence obtained through the auditors' direct physical examination, observation, computation, and inspection is more competent than evidence obtained indirectly.

**dc.** Original documents provide more competent evidence than do copies.

- **ed.** Testimonial evidence obtained under conditions where persons may speak freely is more competent than testimonial evidence obtained under compromising conditions (for example, where the persons may be intimidated).
- *fe.* Testimonial evidence obtained from an individual who is not biased or has complete knowledge about the area is more competent than testimonial evidence obtained from an individual who is biased or has only partial knowledge about the area.
- af. Evidence obtained from a credible third party is may in some cases be more competent than that secured from management or other officials of the audited entity the auditee.
- 7.51 6.55 Auditors may find it useful to obtain from officials of the auditee written representations concerning the competence of the certain evidence they obtain from officials of the audited entity. Written representations ordinarily confirm oral representations given to auditors, indicate and document the continuing appropriateness of such representations, and reduce the possibility of misunderstanding concerning the matters that are the subject of the representations. Written representations can take several forms, including having entity management sign summary documents prepared by the auditors.
- 7.52 6.56 The auditors' approach to determining the sufficiency, competence, and relevance, and competence of evidence depends on the source of the information that constitutes the evidence.
  Information sources include original data gathered by auditors and existing data gathered by

either the auditee *management* or a third party. Data from any of these sources may be obtained from computer-based systems.

7.53 6.57 Data gathered by auditors: Data gathered by auditors include the auditors' own observations and measurements. Among the methods for gathering this type of data are questionnaires, structured interviews, direct observations, and computations. The design of these methods and the skill of the auditors applying them are the keys to ensuring that these data constitute sufficient, competent, and relevant, and competent evidence. When these methods are applied to determine cause, auditors are concerned with eliminating rival explanations.

7.54 6.58 Data gathered by management the Auditee: Auditors can use data gathered by management the auditee as part of their evidence. However, aAuditors may should determine the validity and reliability of these data that are significant to the audit objectives and may do so by direct tests of the data. Auditors can reduce the direct tests of the data if they test the effectiveness of the entity's internal controls over the validity and reliability of the data, and these tests support the conclusion that the controls are effective. The nature and extent of testing of the data will depend on the significance of the data to support auditors' findings.

# [Paragraph 6.59 moved to paragraph 7.58.]

7.55 6.60 Data gathered by third parties: The auditors' evidence may also include data gathered by third parties. In some cases, these data may have been audited by others, or the auditors may

be able to audit the data themselves. In other cases, however, it will not be practical to obtain evidence of the data's validity and reliability. 6.61 How the use of unaudited third-party data affects the auditors' report depends on the data's significance to the auditors' findings. For example, in some circumstances, auditors may use unaudited data to provide background information; however, the use of such unaudited data would generally not be appropriate to support audit findings and conclusions.

7.56 6.62 Validity and reliability of data from computer-based systems: Auditors should obtain sufficient, competent, and relevant evidence that computer-processed data are valid and reliable when those data are significant to the auditors' findings.<sup>5</sup> This work is necessary regardless of whether the data are provided to auditors or auditors independently extract them. <sup>1011</sup> Auditors should determine if other auditors have worked to establish the validity and reliability of the data or the effectiveness of the controls over the system that produced the data. If they have the results of such work is current, auditors may be able to use rely on that work. (See paragraphs 7.25 through 7.27 for requirements when relying on the work of others.) If not, Aauditors may also determine the validity and reliability of computer-processed data by direct tests of the data.

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>When the reliability of a computer-based system is the primary objective of the audit, the auditors should conduct a review of the system's general and application controls.

When computer-processed data are used by the auditor, or included in the report, for background or informational purposes and are not significant to the auditors' findings, citing the source of the data and stating that they were not verified will satisfy the reporting standards for accuracy and completeness set forth in this statement.

7.57 6.62 Auditors can reduce the direct tests of the data if they test the effectiveness of general and application controls over computer-processed data, and these tests support the conclusion that the controls are effective. If auditors determine that internal controls over data which are significantly dependent upon computerized information systems are not effective or if auditors do not plan to test the effectiveness of such controls, auditors should include audit documentation regarding the basis for that conclusion by addressing (1) the reasons why the design or operation of the controls is ineffective, or (2) the reasons why it is inefficient to test the controls. In such circumstances, auditors should also include audit documentation regarding their reasons for concluding that the planned audit procedures are effectively designed to achieve specific audit objectives. This documentation should address

- a. the rationale for determining the types and extent of planned audit procedures;
- b. the kinds and competence of available evidence produced outside a computerized information system; and
- c. the effect on the audit report if the evidence gathered during the audit does not allow the auditors to achieve audit objectives.

<sup>6</sup>A GAO guide, Assessing the Reliability of Computer-Based Data (GAO/OP-8.1.3, September 1990), provides guidance on the following key steps: (1) determining how computer-based data will be used and how they will affect the audit objectives, (2) finding out what is known about the data and the system that produced them, (3) obtaining an understanding of relevant system controls, which can reduce risk to an acceptable level, (4) testing the data for reliability, and (5) disclosing the data source and how data reliability was established or qualifying the report if data

reliability could not be established.

7.58 6.59 When the auditors' tests of data disclose errors in the data, or when they are unable to obtain sufficient, competent, and relevant, and competent evidence about the validity and reliability of the data, they may find it necessary to

- a. seek evidence from other sources.
- **b.** redefine the audit's objectives to eliminate the need to use the data, or
- **c.** use the data, but clearly indicate in their report the data's limitations and refrain from making unwarranted conclusions or recommendations.

## Evidence Indicative of Fraud, Illegal Acts.

# Or Other Noncompliance

7.59 6.32 Auditors should be alert to situations or transactions that could be indicative of *fraud*, illegal acts (violations of laws and regulations), or other noncompliance (violations of other compliance requirements such as provisions of contracts or grant agreements). When information comes to the auditors' attention (through audit procedures, tips allegations received through fraud hotlines, or other means) indicating that fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance may have occurred, auditors should consider whether the possible fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance could significantly affect the audit results. If they could, the auditors should extend the audit steps and procedures, as necessary, (1) to determine if the fraud,

illegal acts, *or other noncompliance* have or are likely to have occurred and (2) if so, to determine their effect on the audit results.

7.60 6.36 Auditors' training, experience, and understanding of the program being audited may provide a basis for recognizingtion that some acts coming to their attention may be indicative of fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance. Whether an act is, in fact, is illegal is a determination normally to be made through the judicial or other adjudicative system and is beyond auditors' professional capacity expertise and responsibility. However, auditors are responsible for being aware of vulnerabilities to fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance associated with the area being audited in order to be able to identify indications that fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance may have occurred. In some circumstances, conditions such as the following might indicate a heightened risk of fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance:

- a. Auditees offer unreasonable explanations to the auditors' inquiries. weak management which fails to enforce existing internal control or to provide adequate oversight over the control process;
- b. Auditees are annoyed at reasonable questions by auditors. inadequate separation of duties, especially those that relate to controlling and safeguarding resources;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Fraud is a type of illegal act involving the obtaining of something of value through willful misrepresentation.

- c. Auditees refuse to provide records. transactions that are out of the ordinary and are not satisfactorily explained, such as unexplained adjustments in inventories or other resources;
- **d.** *instances when employees of the audited entity* Auditees refuse to take vacations or accept promotions-;
- e. missing or altered documents, or unexplained delays in providing information;
- f. false or misleading information; or
- g. history of impropriety, such as past audits or investigations with findings of questionable or criminal activity.
- 7.61 6.33 Auditors should exercise due professional care judgment in pursuing indications of possible fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance so as not to interfere with potential investigations, legal proceedings, or both. Under some circumstances, laws, regulations, or policies require auditors to report indications of certain types of illegal acts to law enforcement or investigatory authorities before extending audit steps and procedures. Auditors may also be required to withdraw from or defer further work on the audit or a portion of the audit in order not to interfere with an investigation.

7.62 6.38 An audit made in accordance with these standards provides reasonable assurance of detecting fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance that could significantly affect the audit results that its objectives have been achieved; it does not guarantee the discovery of fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance abuse. Nor does the subsequent discovery of illegal such acts or abuse committed during the audit period necessarily mean that the auditors' performance was inadequate, provided the audit was made in accordance with these standards.

6.3424 The term noncompliance has a broader meaning than illegal acts. Noncompliance includes not only illegal acts, but also violations of provisions of contracts or grant agreements. Like illegal acts, these other types of noncompliance can be significant to audit objectives. The auditors' considerations in planning and performing tests of compliance with provisions of contracts or grant agreements are similar to those discussed in paragraphs 6.2818 through 6.3323.

7.63 6.35 Abuse is distinct from illegal acts and other noncompliance. When abuse occurs, no law, regulation, contract provision, or grant agreement is violated. Rather, the conduct of a government program falls far short of societal expectations for prudent behavior program management. Auditors should be alert to situations or transactions that could be indicative of abuse. When information comes to the auditors' attention (through audit procedures, tips allegations received through a fraud hotline, or other means) indicating that abuse may have occurred, auditors should consider whether the possible abuse could significantly affect the audit results. If it could, the auditors should extend the audit steps and procedures, as necessary, (1) to determine if the abuse occurred and (2) if so, to determine its effect on the audit results.

However, because the determination of abuse is so subjective, auditors are not expected to provide reasonable assurance of detecting it.

#### **WORKING PAPERS**

### **AUDIT DOCUMENTATION**

7.64 6.46 The fourth field work standard for performance audits is:

Auditors should prepare and maintain audit documentation. Audit documentation should contain sufficient information to enable an experienced reviewer, who has had no previous connection with the audit, to ascertain from the audit documentation the evidence that supports the auditors' significant judgments and conclusions. Audit documentation that supports significant findings, conclusions, and recommendations should be complete before auditors issue their report.

7.65 The form and content of audit documentation should be designed to meet the circumstances of the particular audit. The information contained in audit documentation constitutes the principal record of the work that the auditors have performed and the conclusions that the auditors have reached. The quantity, type, and content of audit documentation is a matter of the auditors' professional judgment.

7.66 6.63 Working papers Audit documentation serves three main purposes: (1) to provide the principal support for the auditors' report, T hey (2) to aid the auditors in conducting and supervising the audit, provide the principal support for the auditors' report, and (3) to allow others to for the review of the audit's quality. This third purpose is important because audits done in accordance with GAGAS often are subject to review by other auditors and by oversight officials. Working papers Audit documentation allows for the review of audit quality by providing the reviewer written documentation, either in written or electronic formats, of the evidence supporting the auditors' significant judgments and conclusions and judgments.

7.67 Audit organizations should establish reasonable policies and procedures for the safe custody and retention of audit documentation for a time sufficient to satisfy legal and administrative requirements. If audit documentation is only retained electronically, the audit organization should ensure that the electronic documentation is capable of being accessed throughout the specified retention period established for audit documentation and is safeguarded through sound computer security.

6.46 Working papers should contain sufficient information to enable an experienced auditor having no previous connection with the audit to ascertain from them *identify* the evidence that supports the auditors' significant conclusions and judgments.<sup>15</sup>

7.68 6.64 Working papers Audit documentation should contain

**a.** the objectives, scope, and methodology, including any sampling and other selection criteria used;

b. documentation of the auditors' determination that certain standards do not apply or that an applicable standard was not followed, the reasons therefor, and the known effect that not following the standard had, or could have, on the audit;

bc. documentation of the work performed to support significant judgments and conclusions and judgments; including descriptions of transactions and records examined that would enable an experienced reviewer to examine the same transactions and record; <sup>12</sup> and

**cd.** evidence of supervisory review of the work performed.

7.69 6.65 One factor uUnderlying GAGAS audits is that federal, state, and local governments and other organizations cooperate in auditing programs of common interest so that the auditors may use others' work and avoid duplicate audit efforts. In addition, audits performed in accordance with GAGAS are subject to quality control and assurance reviews. Auditors should make aArrangements should be made so that working papers to make audit documentation will be made available, upon request, in a timely manner to other auditors or

requirement by listing file numbers, case numbers, or other means of identifying specific documents they examined. They are not required to include in the working papers audit documentation copies of documents they examined, nor are they required to list detailed information from those documents.

The nature of this documentation will vary with the nature of the work performed. For example, when this work includes examination of *management's* auditee records, the working papers audit documentation should describe those records so that an experienced auditor reviewer would be able to examine those same records. Auditors may meet this

reviewers. Contractual arrangements for GAGAS audits should provide for *full and timely* access to working papers audit documentation to facilitate reliance by other auditors on the auditors' work, as well as reviews of audit quality control and assurance and reliance by other auditors on the auditors' work. Audit organizations should also establish reasonable policies and procedures for the safe custody and retention of working papers for a time sufficient to satisfy legal and administrative requirements.

#### CHAPTER 78

#### REPORTING STANDARDS FOR PERFORMANCE AUDITS

### PURPOSEINTRODUCTION

8.1 7.1 This chapter prescribes standards of reporting standards and provides guidance to auditors reporting on for performance audits in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS). The report "contents" and "presentation" standards also apply to some financial related audits, as discussed in chapter 5. The reporting standards for performance audits relate to the form of the report, the report contents, report quality, and report issuance and distribution.

#### **FORM**

8.2 7.2 The first reporting standard for performance audits is:

Auditors should prepare written audit reports communicating the results of each audit.

8.3 The form of the audit report should be appropriate for its intended use. Auditors should use their professional judgment including consideration of users' needs, likely demand, and distribution in determining the form of the audit report. In addition to a more formal

presentation of audit results, such as a chapter report or a letter report, briefing slides may be considered audit reports. Audit reports also may be presented on electronic media that are retrievable by report users and the audit organization, such as video, or compact disk formats. However, to comply with these standards, audit reports, regardless of form, should comply with all applicable reporting standards.

**8.4 7.4** This standard is not intended to limit or prevent discussion of findings, judgments, conclusions, and recommendations with persons who have responsibilities involving the area being audited. On the contrary, such discussions are encouraged.

8.5 7.3 Written Audit reports (1) communicate the results of audits to officials at all various levels of government, (2) make the results less susceptible to misunderstanding, (3) make the results available for public inspection, and (4) facilitate follow-up to determine whether appropriate corrective actions have been taken. The need to maintain public accountability for government program demands that audit reports be *retrievable* written.

8.6 7.5 When an audit is terminated prior to before it is completed ion, auditors should communicate the termination that fact to the auditee management of the audited entity, the entity requesting the audit, and other appropriate officials, preferably in writing. In the absence of an audit report,

<sup>\*</sup>Audit reports may be presented on other media that are retrievable by report users and the audit organization. Retrievable audit reports include those which are in electronic, or video formats:

Auditors should also write a memorandum for the record *that* summariz*esing* the results of the work *to the date of termination* and explainsing why the audit was terminated.

#### **Timeliness**

7.6 The second reporting standard for performance audits is:

Auditors should appropriately issue the reports should be issued to make the information available for timely use by management, legislative officials, and other interested parties.

(Paragraphs 7.7 and 7.8 moved to paragraphs 8.37 and 8.38)

#### **REPORT CONTENTS**

8.7 7.9 The third second reporting standard for performance audits covers the report contents. is:

The audit report should include the objectives, scope, and methodology; the audit results, including findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as appropriate; a reference to compliance with generally accepted government auditing standards; the views of responsible officials; and, if applicable, the nature of any privileged and confidential information omitted.

8.8 7.10 Auditors should include in the report the audit objectives and the audit scope and methodology used for achieving the audit objectives. [bolding removed] 7.11 Knowledge of the objectives of the audit, as well as of the audit scope and methodology for achieving the objectives, This information is needed by readers report users to understand the purpose of the audit, judge the merits and the nature of the audit work performed, to provide perspective as to and what is reported, and to understand any significant limitations in audit objectives, scope, or methodology. Auditors should also report the status of uncorrected significant findings and recommendations from prior audits that affect the objectives of the current audit.

### **Objectives**

8.9 7.12 Audit objectives should be communicated to knowledgeable users by reporting the questions that were to be answered in the audit in a clear, specific, and neutral manner that avoids unstated assumptions. In reporting the audit's objectives, auditors should explain why the audit organization undertook the assignment was made and state what the report is to accomplish, and why the subject matter is important. Articulating what the report is to accomplish normally involves identifying the audit subject and the aspect of performance examined; and because what is reported depends on the objectives, communicating what finding elements are discussed and whether

<sup>-</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Significant findings and recommendations are those matters, that if not corrected, could affect the results of the auditors' work and users' conclusions about those results.

conclusions and recommendations are given. The reported audit objectives provide more meaningful information to report users if they are measurable and feasible and avoid being presented in a broad or general manner. .7.13 To preclude reduce misunderstanding in cases where the objectives are particularly limited and broader objectives can be inferred, it may be necessary to state objectives that were not pursued.

## Scope and Methodology

8.10 7.14 In reporting the scope of the audit, auditors should describe the depth and coverage of work conducted to accomplish the audit's objectives. Auditors should, as applicable, explain the relationship between the universe *population of items sampled* and what was audited; identify organizations, geographic locations, and the period covered; report the kinds and sources of evidence; and explain any quality or other problems with the evidence. Auditors should also report significant constraints imposed on the audit approach by data limitations or scope impairments.

8.11 7.15 To report the methodology used, auditors should clearly explain how the audit objectives were accomplished including the evidence gathering and analysis techniques used in sufficient detail to allow knowledgeable users of their reports to understand the work. This explanation should identify any significant assumptions made in conducting the audit; describe any comparative techniques applied; describe the criteria used; and when sampling significantly supports auditors' findings, describe the sample design and state why it was chosen, including whether the results can be projected to the intended population.

8.12 7.16 Auditors should attempt to avoid misunderstanding by the reader report user concerning the work that was and was not done to achieve the audit objectives, particularly when the work was limited because of constraints on time or resources. The auditors' report should clearly describe the scope of the work performed and any limitations, the applicable standards that were not followed, and the reasons therefor, and how not following the applicable standards affected or could affect the results of the work. For example, if the auditors are unable to determine the reliability of information from an agency's database, and information from this database is critical to the audit findings, the report should clearly state the limitations associated with the information and refrain from making unwarranted conclusions or recommendations. In these situations, the audit report should also include the reasons the auditors were unable to perform this work and the potential impact on the findings if the information is not reliable.

#### **Audit Results**

8.13 7.17 Auditors should report significant audit findings, and where applicable, auditors' conclusions [bolding removed] by providing credible and convincing evidence that relates to the audit objectives. An audit report is improved when it provides sufficient contextual sophistication to reflect an understanding of the issues and an awareness of the external environment, including sensitivity to relevant trends. The report should provide selective background information to provide the context for the overall message and to help the reader understand the significance of

the issues discussed.<sup>2</sup> 7.26 Auditors should report The report should also include all significant instances of fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance<sup>3</sup> and all significant instances of abuse that were found during or in connection with the audit [bolding removed] and 7.34 Auditors should report the scope of their work on management controls and any significant weaknesses in management internal controls found during the audit, and where applicable, auditors' conclusions.<sup>4</sup>

# **Findings**

8.14 7.18 Auditors should report the significant findings developed in response to each audit objective. These findings In reporting the findings, auditors should include should be supported by sufficient, competent, and relevant information evidence. They also should be presented in a manner to promote adequate understanding of the matters reported and to provide convincing but fair presentations in proper perspective. Auditors should also report appropriate background information that readers need to understand the findings.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Appropriate background information may include information on how programs/operations work, the significance of programs/operations (i.e., dollars, impact, purposes, and past audit work if relevant), a description of the audited entity's responsibilities, and explanation of terms, organizational structure, and statutory basis for the program/operations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Whether a particular act is, in fact, illegal may have to await final determination by a court of law. Thus, when auditors disclose matters that have led them to conclude that an illegal act is likely to have occurred, they should take care not to imply that they have made a determination of illegality. See paragraph 8.17 for additional reporting considerations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Significant weaknesses in internal controls may be discussed in the report as an element of a finding. Many times these weaknesses will be described as the cause of the finding or in "a process finding" will be the condition element. Paragraphs 7.46 through 7.49 describe the elements of a finding.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Audit findings not included in the audit report, because of insignificance, should be separately communicated to the auditee, preferably in writing. Such findings, when communicated in a management letter to top management, should be referred to in the audit report. All communications of audit findings should be documented in the working papers.

8.15 7.19 As discussed in chapter 7, Audit findings often have been regarded as containing the elements of criteria, condition, cause, and effect, plus cause when problems are found. However, the elements needed for a finding depend entirely on the audit objectives of the audit. Thus, a finding or set of findings is complete to the extent that the audit objectives are satisfied and the report clearly relates those objectives to the finding's elements of the finding.

8.16 Auditors should develop the elements of a finding in the audit report, as appropriate to satisfy the audit objectives. In reporting on elements of findings, auditor may find it useful to consider the following guidance on each finding element.

a. <u>Criteria</u>: An audit report is improved when it provides information so that the report user will be able to determine what is the required or desired state or what is expected from the program or operation. The criteria are easier to understand when stated fairly, explicitly, and completely, and the source of the criteria are identified in the audit report.<sup>5</sup>

\_\_\_\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>See description of the elements of a finding in paragraphs 6.49 through 6.52

Common sources for criteria are laws, regulations, policy, procedures, best or standard practice, or assertions. The Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government (GAO/AIMD-00-21.3.1, November 1999) and Internal Control—Integrated Framework, published by the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO Report) are two sources of established criteria auditors can use to support their judgments and conclusions about internal control.

- b. <u>Condition</u>: The audit report is improved when it provides evidence of what the auditors found regarding the actual situation. Reporting the scope or extent of the condition allows the report user to gain an accurate perspective.
- c. <u>Cause</u>: The audit report is improved when it provides convincing evidence on the factor or factors responsible for the difference between condition and criteria. In reporting the cause, auditors may consider whether the evidence provides a reasonable and persuasive argument for why the stated cause is the key factor or factors contributing to the difference as opposed to other possible causes, such as poorly designed criteria or factors uncontrollable by program management. The auditors also may consider whether the identified cause serves as a basis for the recommendations.
- d. Effect: The audit report is improved when it provides a clear, logical link to establish the impact of the difference between what the auditors found (condition) and what should be (criteria). Effect is easier to understand when it is stated clearly, concisely and in concrete terms. The significance of the reported effect can be demonstrated through credible evidence.
- **8.17 7.27** When auditors conclude, based on evidence obtained, that significant fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance either has occurred or is likely to have occurred, they should include in their audit report the relevant information. The term "noncompliance" comprises illegal acts (violations

of laws and regulations)<sup>7</sup> and violations of provisions of contracts or grant agreements. When auditors conclude significant abuse has or is likely to have occurred, they should also include relevant information in the report. Abuse occurs when the conduct of a government organization, program, activity, or function falls far short of societal expectations for prudent behavior.

8.18 7.28 In reporting significant instances of noncompliance, auditors should place their findings in perspective. To give the reader report user a basis for judging the prevalence and consequences of noncompliance, the instances of noncompliance should be related to the universe population or the number of cases examined and quantified in terms of dollar value, if appropriate. If the results cannot be projected, the conclusion should be limited to the items tested.

8.19 7.35 In rReporting on management internal controls, will vary depending on the significance of any weaknesses found and the relationship of those weaknesses to the audit objectives 7.36. In audits where the sole objective is to audit the management internal controls, weaknesses found of significance to warrant reporting would be considered deficiencies and be so identified in the audit report. The management controls that were assessed should be identified to the extent necessary to clearly present the objectives, scope, and methodology of the audit. auditors should describe the scope of internal control testing, and in presenting the results of those tests, report the significant

<sup>-</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Whether a particular act is, in fact, illegal may have to await final determination by a court of law. Thus, when auditors disclose matters that have led them to conclude that an illegal act is likely to have occurred, they should take care not to imply that they have made a determination of illegality.

deficiencies weaknesses.<sup>6</sup> 7.37 In a performance audit, a Auditors may identify significant weaknesses in management internal controls as the cause of deficient performance. In reporting this type of finding, the control weaknesses would be described as the "cause."

8.20 7.29 When auditors detect nonsignificant instances of fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance or nonsignificant instances of abuse or weaknesses in internal control, they should communicate them to the auditee officials of the audited program, preferably in writing. Auditors should document in their working papers include in their audit documentation all communications to the auditee officials of the audited program about fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance and instances of abuse or internal control weaknesses. If the auditors have communicated such instances of fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance, abuse, and internal control weaknesses in a management letter to top management, they auditors should refer to that management letter in the audit report.

Compliance With Laws and Regulations

Noncompliance and Abuse

Direct Reporting of Fraud and Illegal Acts

8.21 7.26 In some circumstances, auditors should report illegal acts directly to parties external to the audited entity. 7.30 Auditors are responsible for reporting certain fraud and illegal acts

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Significant weaknesses are matters coming to the auditors' attention that they believe should be reported to officials of the audited program because they could adversely affect the program under audit.

directly to parties outside the auditee audited entity in certain circumstances, as discussed in the following paragraphs. Auditors should fulfill these responsibilities even if they have resigned or been dismissed from the audit.<sup>7</sup>

8.22 7.31 The auditee Officials of the audited entity may be required by law or regulation to report certain fraud and illegal acts to specified external parties (for example, to such as a federal inspector general or a state attorney general). If auditors have communicated such fraud and illegal acts to the auditee officials of the audited entity, and it they fails to report them, then the auditors should communicate their awareness of that failure to the auditee's audited entity's governing body. If the auditee officials of the audited entity does not make the required report as soon as practical after the auditors' communication with its governing body, then the auditors should report the fraud and illegal acts directly to the external party specified in the law or regulation.

8.23 7.32 Auditors should obtain sufficient, competent, and relevant evidence (for example, by such as confirmation with outside parties) to corroborate assertions by management that it has reported fraud or illegal acts. If they are unable to do so, then the auditors should report the fraud or illegal acts directly as discussed above.

8.24 7.33 Chapter 6 reminds auditors that under some circumstances, IL aws, regulations, or policies other authority may require them auditors to report promptly indications of certain types of fraud or

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Internal audit<del>ors auditing within the entity that employs them *organizations* do not have a duty to report outside that entity *unless required by law, rule, regulation, or policy*.</del>

other illegal acts to law enforcement or investigatory authorities. In such circumstances, \text{Ww}hen auditors conclude that fraud or another this type of illegal act either has occurred or is likely to have occurred, they should refer it to law enforcement or investigatory authorities and ask those authorities and/or legal counsel if reporting certain information about the potential fraud or illegal act would compromise investigative or legal proceedings. Auditors should limit the extent of their reporting to matters that would not compromise those proceedings, such as information that is already a part of the public record.

## **Conclusions**

8.25 7.20 Auditors should report conclusions when called for by the audit objectives. Conclusions are logical inferences about the program based on the auditors' findings and should flow from the findings, instead of representing a summary of them. Conclusions should be specified and not left to be inferred by readers clearly stated, not implied. The strength of the auditors' conclusions depends on the persuasiveness of the evidence supporting the findings and the convincingness soundness of the logic used to formulate the conclusions. Conclusions are stronger if they set up the report's recommendations and convince the knowledgeable user of the report that action is necessary.

#### Recommendations

8.26 7.21 If warranted, Aauditors should report make recommendations for actions to improve programs and operations and to correct problem areas identified during the audit. and to improve operations. [Bolding removed] 7.22 Auditors should report make recommendations when the potential for significant improvement in programs, operations, and performance is substantiated by the reported findings and conclusions. Recommendations should logically flow from the evidence and need to state clearly the actions to be taken. Recommendations to effect compliance with laws and regulations and improve management internal controls also should also be made when significant instances of fraud, illegal acts, or other noncompliance are noted or significant abuse or weaknesses in controls are found. Auditors should also report the status of uncorrected significant findings and recommendations from prior audits that affect the objectives of the current audit.

8.27 7.23 Constructive recommendations can encourage improvements in the conduct of government programs and operations. For Rrecommendations to be are most constructive, when they should be are directed at resolving the cause of identified problems, are action-oriented and specific, are addressed to parties that have the authority to act, are feasible practical, and, to the extent practical feasible, are cost-effective, and measurable.

Statement on Compliance With

**Generally Accepted Government** Auditing Standards

8.28 7.24 Auditors should report that the audit was made in accordance with generally accepted

government auditing standards. [Bolding removed] 7.25 The statement of compliance with *GAGAS* 

generally accepted government auditing standards refers to all the applicable standards that the

auditors should have followed during the audit. The statement should be qualified in situations in

which the auditors did not follow an applicable standard. In these situations, auditors should report

in the scope section the applicable standard that was not followed, the reasons therefor, and how not

following the standard affected the results of the audit.

**Compliance With Laws and Regulations** 

(paragraph **7.26** moved to **8.13** and **8.21**)

Noncompliance and Abuse

(paragraphs **7.27** through **7.29** moved to paragraphs **8.17**, **8.18**, and **8.20**)

**Direct Reporting of Illegal Acts** 

(paragraphs 7.30 through 7.33 moved to paragraphs 8.21 through 8.24)

15

# **Management Controls**

(paragraphs 7.35 through 7.37 moved to paragraph 8.19)

Views of Responsible Officials

8.29 7.38 Auditors should report the views of responsible officials of the audited program concerning auditors' findings, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as corrections planned.

[Bolding removed] 7.39 One of the most effective ways to ensure that a report is fair, complete, and objective is to obtain advance review and comments by responsible auditee officials of the audited entity and others, as may be appropriate. Including the views of responsible officials produces a report that shows not only what was found, and what the auditors think about it, but also what the responsible persons officials in the audited entity think about it the report and what they plan to do about it.

8.30 7.40 Auditors should normally request that the responsible officials' views on significant findings, conclusions, and recommendations be submitted in writing. When, in these cases, written comments are not obtained, oral comments should be requested. Oral comments are acceptable as well, and, in some cases, may be the only or most expeditious way to obtain comments. Cases in which obtaining oral comments can be effective include when there is a time-critical need to meet a user's needs; the auditor has worked closely with the responsible officials throughout the conduct of the work and the parties are very familiar with the findings and issues addressed in the draft product; or the auditor does not expect major disagreements with the draft report's findings,

conclusions, and recommendations, or perceive any major controversies with regard to the issues discussed in the draft report. Auditors should prepare a summary of the officials' oral comments and provide a copy of the summary to management of the audited entity to verify that the comments are accurately stated.

**8.31 7.41** Advance eComments should be *fairly and* objectively evaluated and recognized, as appropriate, in the *final* report. Advance eComments, such as a promise or plan for corrective action, should be noted but should not be accepted as justification for dropping a significant finding or a related recommendation.

8.32 7.42 When the audited entity's comments state that the comments oppose the report's findings, conclusions, or recommendations are inaccurate or misleading and those comments are not, and are not, in the auditors' opinion, valid, the auditors may choose to should state their reasons for rejecting them disagreeing with the comments. The auditors' disagreement should be stated in a fair and objective manner. Conversely, the auditors should modify their report as necessary if they find the comments valid. Auditors may wish to attach the comment letter to the audit report to provide the reader with both points of view.

**Noteworthy Accomplishments** 

7.43 Auditors should report noteworthy accomplishments, particularly when management improvements in one area may be applicable elsewhere.

7.44 Noteworthy management accomplishments identified during the audit, which were within the scope of the audit, should be included in the audit report along with deficiencies. Such information provides a more fair presentation of the situation by providing appropriate balance to the report. In addition, inclusion of such accomplishments may lead to improved performance by other government organizations that read the report.

**Issues Needing Further Study** 

7.45 Auditors should refer significant issues needing further audit work to the auditors responsible for planning future audit work.

7.46 If, during the audit, auditors identify significant issues that warrant further work, but the issues are not directly related to the audit objectives or the auditors do not have the time or resources to expand the audit to pursue them, they should refer the issues to the auditors within the audit organization who are responsible for planning future audit work. When appropriate, auditors should also disclose the issues in the report and the reasons the issues need further study.

Privileged and Confidential Information

**8.33 7.47** If certain information is prohibited from general disclosure, auditors should report the nature of the information omitted and the requirement that makes the omission necessary. [Bolding

removed] 7.48 Certain information may be prohibited from general disclosure by federal, state, or local laws or regulations. Such information may be provided on a need-to-know basis In such circumstances, auditors may issue a separate limited official use report containing such information and distribute the report only to persons authorized by law or regulation to receive it. 7.49 The aAuditors should obtain assurance that a valid requirement for the omission exists, and, when appropriate, consult with legal counsel regarding any requirements or other circumstances that may necessitate the omission of certain information. 7.49 If such requirements prohibit auditors from including make the judgment that certain pertinent information should be excluded from in the a publicly available report, they should state the nature of the information omitted and the requirement reasons that makes-the omission necessary.

8.34 Additional circumstances associated with public safety and security concerns could also justify the exclusion of certain information in the report. For example, detailed information related to computer security for a particular program may be excluded from publicly available reports because of the potential damage that could be caused by the misuse of this information. In such circumstances, auditors may issue a limited official use report containing such information and distribute the report only to those parties responsible for acting on the auditors' recommendations. If auditors make the judgment that certain additional information should be excluded from a publicly available report, they should state the nature of the information omitted and the reasons that makes the omission necessary.

8.35 Auditors are expected to act with integrity in judging whether any information should be excluded from publicly available reports. These judgments need to be made in a consistent manner with consideration of the broader public interest in the program or activity under review. Auditors need to weigh the need to reveal all significant facts known to them which, if not revealed, could either distort the results or conceal improper or unlawful practice against any requirements or other circumstances that may necessitate the omission of certain information.

## REPORT PRESENTATION REPORT OUALITY

**8.36** 7.50 The *third* fourth reporting standard for performance audits is:

The reports should be *timely*, <del>complete</del> *fact-based*, accurate, objective, convincing, *clear*, and as <del>clear and</del> concise as the subject permits.

# **Timely**

8.37 7.7 To be of maximum use, the audit report needs to provide relevant information in time to respond to management, legislative officials, and other users' legitimate needs. must be timely.

Likewise, the information provided in the report needs to be current. A carefully prepared report

may be of little value to decisionmakers if it arrives too late. Therefore, auditors should plan for the appropriate issuance of the report and conduct the audit with this these goals in mind.

**8.38 7.8 During the audit, the** The auditors should consider interim reporting, during the audit, of significant matters to appropriate *entity* officials. Such communication, which may be oral or written, is not a substitute for a final report, but it does alert officials to matters needing immediate attention and permits them to correct them before the final report is completed.

# Complete Fact-Based

8.39 7.51 Being complete fact-based requires that the report contains all information evidence needed to satisfy the audit objectives; and promotes an adequate and correct understanding of the matters reported. ;and meet the report content requirements. It also means the report states information and findings completely, including all necessary facts and explanations. including appropriate background information: 7.52 Giving readers report users an adequate and correct understanding means providing perspective on the extent and significance of reported findings, such as the frequency of occurrence relative to the number of cases or transactions tested, and the relationship of the findings to the entity's operations.

**8.40 7.53** In most cases, a single example of a deficiency is not sufficient to support a broad conclusion or a related recommendation. All that it supports is that a deviation, an error, or a

weakness existed. However, except as necessary, *Sufficient* detailed supporting data need not *should* be included to make convincing presentations.

#### **Accurate**

8.41 7.54 Accuracy requires that the evidence presented be true and that findings be correctly portrayed. The need for accuracy is based on the need to assure readers report users that what is reported is credible and reliable. One inaccuracy in a report can cast doubt on the validity of an entire report and can divert attention from the substance of the report. Also, use of inaccurate evidence reports can damage the credibility of the issuing audit organization and reduce the effectiveness of its reports.

8.42 7.55 The report should include only information, findings, and conclusions that are supported by competent and relevant evidence in the auditors' working papers audit documentation. If data are significant to the audit findings and conclusions, but are not audited, the auditors should clearly indicate in their report the data's limitations and not make unwarranted conclusions or recommendations based on those data.

8.43 7.56 Reported evidence should demonstrate the correctness and reasonableness of the matters reported. Correct portrayal means describing accurately the audit scope and methodology, and presenting findings and conclusions in a manner consistent with the scope of audit work. The report should not have errors in logic and reasoning. One way to help ensure accuracy in the report is

to use a quality control process such as referencing. Referencing is a process in which statements of facts, figures, and dates are traced back to the supporting working papers by an experienced auditor who is independent of the audit. This process is designed to ensure that sufficient credible evidence is present to support the report's conclusions and recommendations.

# **Objective**

8.44 7.57 Objectivity requires that the presentation of the entire report be balanced in content and tone. A report's credibility is significantly enhanced when it presents evidence in an unbiased manner so that readers report users can be persuaded by the facts. 7.58 The audit report should be fair and not misleading, and should place the audit results in perspective. This means presenting the audit results impartially and fairly guarding against the tendency to exaggerate or overemphasize deficient performance. In describing shortcomings in performance, auditors should put findings in context. For example, the audited entity may have faced present the explanation of responsible officials including the consideration of any unusual difficulties or circumstances they faced.

8.45 7.59 The tone of reports should encourage decisionmakers to act on the auditors' findings and recommendations. This tone should be balanced by requiring reports to present sound and logical evidence to support conclusions, while refraining from using adjectives or adverbs that characterize evidence in a way that implies criticism or conclusion by innuendo. Although findings should be presented clearly and forthrightly, the auditors should keep in mind that one of their objectives is to persuade, and that this can best be done by avoiding language that generates

defensiveness and opposition. Although criticism of past performance is often necessary, the report should emphasize needed improvements.

8.46 The report should also recognize the positive aspects of the program reviewed if applicable to the audit objectives. Inclusion of-positive program aspects may lead to improved performance by other government organizations that read the report.

# Convincing

8.47 7.60 Being convincing requires that the audit results be responsive to the audit objectives, the findings be presented persuasively, and the conclusions and recommendations follow logically from the facts presented. The information presented should be sufficient to convince the readers report users to recognize the validity of the findings, the reasonableness of the conclusions, and the benefit of implementing the recommendations. Reports designed in this way can help focus the attention of responsible officials on the matters that warrant attention and can help stimulate correction.

## Clear

**8.48 7.61** Clarity requires that the report be easy to read and understand. Reports should be written *prepared* in language as clear and simple as the subject permits. **7.62** Use of straightforward, nontechnical language is essential to simplicity of presentation. If *Whenever* technical terms, and

unfamiliar abbreviations, and acronyms are used, they should be clearly defined. Acronyms should be used sparingly:

8.49 Auditors may consider using a summary within the report to capture the report user's attention and highlight the overall message. If a summary is used, it generally should focus on the specific answers to the questions in the audit objectives, summarize the audit's most significant findings and the report's principal conclusions, and prepare users to anticipate the major recommendations.

**8.50 7.63** Logical organization of material, and accuracy and precision in stating facts and in drawing conclusions, are essential to clarity and understanding. Effective use of titles and captions and topic sentences make the report easier to read and understand. Visual aids (such as pictures, charts, graphs, and maps) should be used when appropriate to clarify and summarize complex material.

#### Concise

8.51 7.64 Being concise requires that the report be no longer than necessary to convey and support the message. Too much Extraneous detail detracts from a report, may even conceal the real message, and may confuse or discourage distract readers the users. Also, needless repetition should be avoided. 7.65 Although room exists for considerable judgment in determining the content of reports, those that are complete fact-based, but still concise, are likely to achieve greater results.

#### REPORT ISSUANCE AND DISTRIBUTION

8.52 7.66 The fifth fourth reporting standard for permformance audits is:

Audit organizations should submit Written audit reports are to be submitted by the audit organization to the appropriate officials of the auditee audited program and to the appropriate officials of the organizations requiring or arranging for the audits, including external funding organizations, unless legal restrictions prevent it. Copies of the reports should also be sent to other officials who have legal oversight authority or who may be responsible for acting on audit findings and recommendations and to others authorized to receive such reports. Unless the report is restricted by law or regulation, copies should be made available for public inspection.

8.53 7.67 Audit reports should be distributed in a timely manner to officials interested in the results. Such officials include those designated by law or regulation to receive such reports, those responsible for acting on the findings and recommendations, those of other levels of government who have provided assistance to the auditee audited entity, and legislators. However, if the subject of the audit involves material that is classified for security purposes or is not releasable to particular parties or the public for other valid reasons, auditors may should limit the report distribution.

**8.54 7.68** When nongovernment audit organizations are engaged, the engaging government organization should ensure that the report is distributed appropriately. If the nongovernment audit organization is to make the distribution, the engagement agreement should indicate what which officials or organizations should receive the report.

8.55 7.69 Internal auditors should follow their entity's own arrangements and statutory requirements for distribution. Usually, they report to their entity's top managers, who are responsible for distribution of the report. Further distribution of reports outside the organization should be made in accordance with applicable law, rule, regulation, or policy.